

THE SCOTTISH REVIEW

A QUARTERLY JOURNAL DEVOTED TO THE CAUSE OF THE
INDEPENDENCE OF SCOTLAND.

Volume 40

Autumn, 1917

Part 87

EDITOR - THE HON. R. ERSKINE OF MARR

Contents

Scotland and the Peace Congress.

The English Empire and the Future.

Scottish Trade Unionists and Industrial Unrest. By William Diack.

Empire: Maker of War. By Herbert Moore Pim.

Scotland at Westminster. By H. C. MacNeacail.

The Housing Problem. By John L. Carval.

The Ebel. By Rev. Geoffrey Hill.

Owre the Hill. By Sandy M'Nee.

Correspondence.

Perth:

Milne, Tannahill, & Methven, 12-14 Mill Street.

Edinburgh: 74 George Street.

1522

The Scottish Review

membership represents many thousands of the inhabitants of this kingdom, a large number of lesser societies of a democratic character, as well as many private individuals, have heartily approved the principles laid down in the Protest. A highly gratifying feature characterising the numerous adhesions received from the Executives of the various Scottish Trade Unions is, *that in no single case have such been otherwise than unanimous* on the part of those bodies. In fine, the success of the Protest, in a democratic point of view, is already assured, and we think, further, that any Peace Conference that should refuse to give ear to it would thereby forfeit the confidence, not only of the Scottish democracy, but of the progressive sorts of people in those important countries of the New and Old World to whose accredited leaders we have been at the pains to make known the nature of our claims.

The following are the terms of the Protest which, accompanied with suitable historical illustrations, and expanded into the form of a diplomatic Note, will be presented on the occasion indicated by these remarks. Additional adhesions, whether from democratic bodies or private individuals, are invited, and will be acknowledged by the Editor of this Review.

INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS.

A PROTEST, in name and in behalf, of National Scotland, is to be entered at the International Congress, to be held after the War.

Scotland and the Peace Congress

The Protest will embrace the following heads :—

- (1) Protest against the exclusion of Scotland which, notwithstanding any pretended Act to the contrary, is now, as she ever was, a Sovereign State, and, as such, has an indefeasible right to send her own representatives to any International Congress.
- (2) Protest against the pretended right of England to appear, and speak, in name, and in behalf, of Scotland at any International Congress.



The English Empire and the Future



ISTORY presents us with three sorts of Empires, which are—the Despotic, the Constitutional, and the Cultural. The Mogul Empire is a type of the first, the Roman of the second, and Greece of the third. It is true that during the fifty years of existence of the Greek Empire proper, it lost the strictly cultural character belonging to the confederation of which Athens was the principal constituent, and the liveliest exponent, and then resembled a despotism rather than a Constitutional Empire such as, in a large measure, Rome was. But the springs of the Greek Empire proper were rather cultural than political, and if the Athenian State and its confederates assumed for the brief space of fifty years a form and character different to those which Hellas had previously presented, the departure from fixed principle in question cannot be regarded otherwise than as a kind of aberration on the part of Greece and the associated countries. The value of Hellas to the modern world is, and will always remain, cultural rather than political, and theoretical rather than practical. Her brief adventure into Imperialism proper was an unmitigated disaster. Nature had formed the genius of Hellas in a cultural and not in a political mould, and the pity is that ever she was induced

The English Empire and the Future

by Themistocles to turn her back on her obvious destiny, and embark on the dangerous experiment of imperial "expansion". Vast as is our debt to Hellas, it had been infinitely greater had she resisted temptation and proved herself "true to type" by pursuing her plain destiny as an empire founded on culture, and called into existence in order to diffuse its benefits throughout the world.

The contrast between the Greek and the Roman genius is perhaps best brought out by the fact that the former heartily despised the latter. Roman utilitarianism, conjoined with that rugged strength of mind and character, and stern attachment to "law and order" which distinguished the conquerors of the world, excited the ridicule of the Greeks, and this fact largely explains the failure of Hellas to support "the burden of empire" for a longer period than fifty years. The Roman genius, on the other hand, was formed to rule. That people possessed the necessary brutality, the required degree of unsensitiveness to criticism, and of unresponsiveness to ideals, and, lastly, of respect for settled law and established custom, in all which qualities the people of ancient Hellas were notably wanting.

A comparison between the Roman and the English political genius has been often drawn, and as this has been mainly done by English hands, we should not be surprised if the conjunction is made to appear as flattering as possible to the vanity of the latter people. Doubtless, there are points of resemblance in the respective careers of the two peoples which are not to be dismissed as being entirely due to sallies of the

The Scottish Review

imagination. And though the rise and fall of races and peoples necessarily present features which are common to the story of all such events, yet will the Roman and the English empire undoubtedly bear comparison the one with the other, if only in respect of their common denominator, which we take to be their prodigious size. The Romans appropriated to themselves the greatest part of the then known world ; and in the sense that the English have done much the same thing as regards the universe of our own times we hold the comparison that has been drawn to be justified, so far as the criterion of relative magnitude is concerned. Moreover, without pressing the analogy too closely, or too far, further reflexion is calculated to persuade us that the Roman and the English genius do undoubtedly shew forth certain features and characteristics between which there exists, especially as regards the political aspect of the two temperaments, an apparent, if not a positive, resemblance. The very qualities on account of which the Greeks ridiculed the Romans are possessed by the English, who could never have got and held together an empire if they were not a severely "practical" people, great utilitarians, Philistines, and liberally endowed with the distinguishing characteristic of the Teutonic peoples, which Schopenhauer declares to be "dull-wittedness," though "idealistic unresponsiveness" would perhaps be a juster term for that useful, if unattractive, quality. Now, in so far as the Romans were possessors and exponents of these truly imperial characteristics, just so far is a comparison between themselves and our neighbours justified.

It has been remarked before now that the Romans

The English Empire and the Future

procured their empire largely at the expense of barbarians, whom they fought and subdued to their rule in a long succession of victories. Doubtless had the late Professor Seely been a Roman writer, in that capacity he would have ventilated the "fortuitous" theory which, as an English writer, he set forth in order to explain the formation of the English Empire. But it is significant that the Roman historians do not allow that Rome acquired her empire without particularly seeking it, or even notably deserving it. They do not admit that their greatness in this respect was rather thrust upon them than deliberately sought after, which Seely held to be the case with regard to the immense possessions acquired by his own countrymen. It should seem, therefore, according to Seely, that if the Romans and the English were equally beholden to barbarians for their respective gains of territories and peoples, the point of resemblance between the two races ceases when we compare the means whereby their respective empires were procured. The Roman was plainly due to lust of conquest, attended by hard fighting, and all its consequent cruelties, miseries, and ills. It would be profane to say more about the formation of the other than that it took its rise, according to Seely, in a stroke, or rather a happy succession of them, on the part of a discriminating Providence. These few general observations may well suffice as introduction to the more particular and extended remarks which our present subject invites us to make.

The first beginnings of English imperialism are to be discerned in the "English Claims," and the wars

The Scottish Review

between Scotland and England to which those pretensions gave rise. It was the avowed object of Edward I. of England to subdue Scotland, in pursuance of the pretensions advanced by certain of his predecessors and notably by himself. Those who are familiar with the contents of early English State papers, so far as these official documents relate to this kingdom, will experience, we imagine, little difficulty in linking up the story of the successive sallies of English aggrandisement and "expansion" with the later history of the English imperialistic movement. England's object in making war upon Scotland, which she repeatedly did upon the shallow pretence of her claims to control the national affairs of this country, was early declared, explicitly through the channel of the "Claims" themselves, and implicitly through the medium of many a State document whose burden was the danger and inconvenience to England of a free and independent Scotland. It was the battle of Bannockburn which finally dissipated the shadowy "Claims" of which we speak. That ever-memorable event settled for many a long year to come the disputed question of whether Scotland was to be a mere feudal fief of England, or was to preserve entire the freedom of this country and the liberties of its people.

But if the English claims to the exercise of a suzerainty over Scotland—the certain forerunner of eventual incorporation into the English monarchy—were dissipated on the occasion we have named, it was the letter rather than the spirit characterising these absurd pretensions which then ceased to be operative in English affairs. After Bannockburn and the

The English Empire and the Future

consequent consolidation of the Scottish monarchy, English means and methods underwent a marked change, though the policy, as the designs, of that country touching ourselves remained substantially unaltered. To stir up internal strife whenever and wherever the conjunctures were favourable thereto ; to keep a band of needy and profligate nobles in constant pay ; to labour diligently to improve all means and occasions of undermining, with a view to utterly destroying, Scottish independence—these were the great articles of English political faith, so far as international relations were concerned. To trace out all the successive steps taken by English diplomacy in order to enable England to "expand" at the expense of Scotland would be a superfluous, as well as a tedious, undertaking. Those successive steps are familiar to the generality of Scotsmen, and if the spirit which prompted those that took them to take them is too little regarded nowadays, it is obvious that the remedy for that state of affairs consists in greater public attention being paid to the doctrinal value of Scottish history.

The reign of Elizabeth of England witnessed a remarkable growth in respect of the imperialistic notions of the people of that country. Brave, experienced, and ambitious seamen of that nation then sailed the seas, and the literature of Shakespeare and other English wits of the first order greatly contributed to foment the national aspirations in the direction of territorial "expansion." Nevertheless, the times and the then existing conjunctures of affairs were not altogether favourable to England's assumption of the

The Scottish Review

"burden of empire." Scotland was still an independent Kingdom; Ireland was but half held; while the general state of European politics was critical and complex in the extreme. The exploits of Drake and his "school" were but a flash in the pan, as it were, bright enough, it is true, momentarily to illumine many a daring face, and many a brave and purposeful deed, but, nevertheless, not sustained enough to suffice to set fire to the tinder which, when fully ignited, should have served to light the lamps of England's imperial destiny. Thus the "capacious mind" and the aspiring genius of Elizabeth were disappointed of their fondest hopes; and with the accession of James VI. to the English throne imperial "expansion" ceased to be a practical political question, so far as the southern kingdom was concerned.

The English Empire dates from the middling years of the eighteenth century. Before that period it did not exist; and when, finally, it came, especial circumstances and conjunctures of a character highly favourable to England alone enabled that country to strike out, or rather to blunder on to that road of conquest to "expansion" into which previous generations of her statesmen had schemed and plotted without avail to turn the nation's energies. The Union of the Crowns, and the consequent enfeebling and impoverishment of Scotland, the sinking "by force and fraud" of the Scottish in the English Parliament, the Jacobite wars of 1715 and 1745; all these events had conspired to weaken and divide Scotland, and so to bring about her long-wished-for removal from the path of English ambition. Ireland, which by a silly, if

The English Empire and the Future

not impudent, fiction on the part of an English Pope had been early "gifted" to an English King, was then quiescent, if not "pacified." The rule of Chesterfield in that country was so successful, from the English point of view, that he appears to have had no difficulty in amusing the good-natured inhabitants to the extent of four battalions of infantry, which were shipped over to Scotland in order to enable that typical Hun, the Duke of Cumberland, and his English Knights of the same Teutonic order, to "put down," by wholesale torture and massacre, the so-called Rebellion of 1745. Prince Charles had now entered upon that prolonged drinking bout which was to terminate with his death many years later, but which was early characterised by a much more melancholy feature, namely, his enduring disgrace. With a Scotland at long last reduced to entire impotence and submission; with Ireland completely bubbled out of its traditional sapience; and a thorny "domestic" problem, in the shape of a disputed succession, in a fair way to be permanently accommodated in favour of the German forebears of the Royal House of Windsor one would be inclined to think that the English would have been ready not to run, but to leap to their imperial destiny, now that the stars in their courses were so uncompromisingly favourable to the national aspirations. Yet, nothing is stranger in all history than the spectacle presented by this "imperial people" when setting about to discharge their self-appointed "mission." They hummed and hawed about the business worse than the most bashful swain that ever courted a retiring nymph. They stood upon the order of their going with a degree of hesitancy, if not

The Scottish Review

of trepidation, which seems singular indeed in a people whose leading Statesmen had for centuries been straining at the leash of imperial expansion and conquest. But before, to hold the language of Burke, we attempt briefly "to point out by what means the English nation came to be exalted above the vulgar level, and to take that lead which they assumed among mankind," it may be as well to throw a little light upon the state of contemporary opinion as regards that matter, at the very time when the immediate future was already big with the English Empire :

Stern o'er each bosom, Reason holds her state,
With daring aims irregularly great ;
Pride in their port, defiance in their eye,
I see the lords of half mankind pass by.

So sang Oliver Goldsmith in 1754, but this highly bombastic effusion of his muse, always absurd, was ridiculously at variance with the facts governing the situation and the temper of the English people at the time in which it was composed. Walpole's disgrace in the year 1742, and the subsequent war of the Austrian Succession, had done little, if anything, to enhance the repute of the English name, or to extend their possessions. The English empire in India, though doubtless forming in 1754, yet was not actually begun till the battle of Plassy in 1757 gave that immense peninsula to the English. Pope, Johnson, Bolingbroke, Glover, and many other contemporary wits of the first order, denounced the war

The English Empire and the Future

with Spain as a "war of plunder." The armed forces of the Kingdom were in a wretched state of inefficiency, and, at the time of the overthrow of Walpole, so low was the spirit of the English people sunk, and so little was that country then deserving of the fulsome compliments subsequently paid her by Burke,¹ that she was under the necessity of hiring foreign troops, the greatest part of which was composed of German levies, in order to defend her own shores. Moreover, when these hirelings were fiercely accused by their paymasters of having deserted their posts, or otherwise discovered the unsoundness, or the insufficiency, of the English investment, the English people did not immediately run to arms in order to repair the mischiefs of which they so bitterly complained, but ingloriously contented themselves with opening a brisk press campaign against those whom they charged with having accepted their money without making them any adequate return for the same. Writing from London in 1745, the same year in which a mere handful of Scottish Gaels had struck abject terror into the uttermost parts of imperial England, the lively, if eccentric, authoress, Mrs. Montagu, paints us a dismal picture of the state of English society at that time.

People of the greatest rank here (she says) have been endeavouring to take the utmost advantage of the unhappy state of their country, and have sold the assistance it was their duty to give. Self-interest has taken such firm possession of every heart that not any threatening calamity can banish it in the smallest instance.

¹ Alluding to Dutch William, Burke says (*Regicide Peace*) that that prince had taught England to regard herself as "the arbitress of Europe," and as "the tutelary angel of the human race"!

The Scottish Review

It is terrible to see people afraid to trust each other on this occasion ; everything is turned to a job, and money given for the general good is converted too much to private use.

The depression, amounting almost to despair, that afflicted the whole of England in 1757, and enfeebled the measures, as it largely paralysed the arms, of the country, may be collected from a series of sermons delivered by a very respectable observer, and published in the year 1760, by which latter date, however, the imperial star of England had begun slowly to emerge from behind the clouds which had hitherto conspired to conceal it from the vision of all save a privileged few whose penetrating powers of perception, like those of the poet Goldsmith, we are to regard rather as a particular gift from the gods of prophecy than as an instance of the vulgar sort of perspicacity.

The time (says this observer in one of his sermons) is not long since the wisest among you thought that our ruin was near at hand. The anxious enquiries after public news ; the despair seen in every countenance on the least miscarriage of our fleets and armies ; our distrust of each other and slavish dread of the enemy, were melancholy symptoms of a nation's fears ; and indeed that fear was far from being groundless. We were deeply engaged in a burdensome and expensive war ; a strange concurrence of accidents had left us the choice of only one ally (Frederick the Great), whom all the world, unacquainted with the resources of his genius, imagined must soon fall an easy prey to his numerous enemies. . . Our army in Europe returned from an ill-planned and ill-executed expedition with signal disgrace, and our fleet was inactive from a supposed neglect. Then at home affairs were, if possible, in a still worse condition ; a general dissatisfaction at the Ministry, unhappy quarrels and contentions for power among the great, supplies raised with murmurs and paid slowly with sullenness ; and, to complete all our unhappiness, the poorer sort of people throughout the whole Kingdom were feeling the quick approaches of what may not im-

The English Empire and the Future

properly be called a general famine, raised and continued, as there is but too much reason to believe, by the acts of avaricious wretches who wanted to make a price of the miseries of their fellow-creatures.

We have already seen that the war with Spain, which, in spite of the disasters that attended it, prepared the way for subsequent imperial expansion on the part of England, was denounced by many as being one "of plunder." Walpole's opposition to that war cost him his place and popularity; but it is worthy of remark that some of those whose antipathy to the Whig minister had been characterised by the most ferocious attacks upon him both as statesman and as man, were quite as much opposed to this particular adventure as he was. Moreover, though the popular feeling, stirred to the depths by the pathetic fable of Captain Jenkin's misfortunes, rose in England to an unprecedented height of frenzy, yet it cannot be said that on this occasion the efforts exerted by the country as a whole bore any sort of just proportion to the clamours and violence of the populace, and that of their instigators of all classes. It is true that an incredible army of English sovereigns was raised and despatched with all imaginable speed to the Continent, but it would appear that the "silver bullet" was then as little capable of bringing a campaign to a victorious close as, spite of recent boasts, it would seem to be so nowadays. English gold might flow like water; the same commodity might be used to grease, to adopt the popular figure, all the outstretched palms in Christendom; but, though this were indeed the case, yet so far were the means employed found to be answerable to the ends designed that the English soon perceived the war

The Scottish Review

to be flourishing against them, notwithstanding their utmost efforts to bribe fortune to give it a different turn and a more favourable complexion. It was just at this dismal conjuncture that, fortunately for the sickly star of imperial England, there arose a few bright spirits, who, imbued with the same high notions, and gifted with courage and resource as abundant and as fertile as animated their fore-runners in the time of Elizabeth, wrested the control of public affairs out of the hands of the jobbers, lawyers, shopkeepers, "business men," and other incompetents, who had usurped the supreme direction, and succeeded after a bitter struggle in transferring it to their own. Under the spirited leadership of these men, among whom Chatham was the principal figure, a different turn and complexion were given to the conduct of English political affairs. The genius of the elder Pitt had early penetrated to the fact that English gold, though useful enough as a lubricant, yet was no solvent. That great man did not reverse the policy, in this respect at least, of his immediate predecessors in office ; but his peculiar merit as Statesman and "empire-builder" consists in the fact that he supplemented it with a contrivance drawn from the history of his own country. The plan he adopted was, to throw the weight of English adventure into the scale of a war of aggression and plunder by sea, while at the same time he arranged to continue to dispense largess with an ungrudging hand as well to the continental allies of his country as to such others as his flock of spies and agents informed him to be not averse from the acceptance of generous bribes. Simultaneously with

The English Empire and the Future

these endeavours, the minister blew up at home a mighty cloud of such patriotic sophistries and conceits as he well knew to be best designed to amuse the muddle-headed English democracy ; and it was under cover of these multiform pretences, zealously fomented and advertised as they were by all the most spirited and adventurous elements in the contemporary English public life, that England was enabled to embark on that career of conquest and territorial acquisition which was eventually to raise her to a commanding situation among the great empires of the world. First India, and then Canada, fell a comparatively easy prey to the continental embarrassments of France, and to the spirit of courage and daring infused into the English measures by reason of the ambition and genius of Chatham. Soon events combined to prove that the policy of the statesman of the eagle-face and the lightning words was abundantly justified, both by reason of its essential daring, and because of the abounding knowledge which it revealed of the capacity and temper of the small band of neo-Elizabethans to which the minister's own courage and unrivalled perspicacity had entrusted its fulfilment. The younger Pitt, if he inherited less of the genius, yet certainly shared to the full in the wisdom and knowledge of State craft that characterised his wonderful sire. His policy, *mutatis mutandis*, was the same with that of his father—wholesale bribery for the continent, conjoined with spirited adventure on the high seas ; and if a study of his career shows him to have been less successful than the elder Pitt was with regard to

The Scottish Review

the second of the two aims distinguishing the policy which Chatham had called into being, or rather revived and re-adjusted to the conjunctures of his own times, we are to ascribe his relative failure not to the unadaptability of the original plan to the circumstances under which the younger Pitt exercised the supreme power, but to the necessity to which that statesman was reduced of relying on inferior material in order to the successful prosecution of the most important part of his own and his father's foreign policy.

It was the deliberate opinion of the historian Gibbon that the most flourishing period in the history, not only of the Roman Empire, but in that of the whole world, extended from the death of Domitian to the accession of the Emperor Commodus. Great historians are prone to such prospects, which may be melancholy or the reverse, according to the natural constitution of their minds. "If a man were called upon to fix the period in the history of the world during which the condition of the human race was most calamitous and afflicted, he would (says the author of the *History of the Reign of the Emperor Charles V.*) without hesitation name that which elapsed from the death of Theodosius the Great to the establishment of the Lombards in Italy." Following these two distinguished precedents, we may well ask what particular period in the short history of the English Empire is to be regarded as embracing the time during which that institution was in its most flourishing state? Would not the historian, without hesitation, name that period which elapsed from the Peace of Vienna

The English Empire and the Future

to the outbreak of the Boer War? During the greatest part of the time we have fixed the "philosophic Radicalism" of Bentley and his school tinctured the statesmanship of England, and conspired to keep the balance true between purple imperialism on the one hand and the colourless cosmopolitanism of Rousseau on the other. During the most of that flourishing period the English Empire was relatively, if not positively, sound in a politico-ethical point of view. Doubtless, economic and social heresies, abuses, and anomalies, flourished; and as regards the attitude of the English democracy towards the problems, and, in short, the "burden" of empire in general, the working-classes of that country were guilty on many occasions in which a very different conduct might have been reasonably expected of them of an extraordinary degree of false sentiment, hypocrisy, selfishness, indifference, and stupidity, especially in regard to problems affecting the national interests of nations encroached on "by the restless foot of English adventure." Nevertheless, it may be readily granted that, on a review of the whole matter, the reign of Bentley's ideas was not only highly creditable to England herself, but reflected very favourably on the empire which she had formed in so equivocal a fashion. It is undoubtedly the case that during the period we have named English political probity, English magnanimity, and English justice and love of fair-play stood relatively high among the nations of the world, which, after Waterloo, and for many years subsequent to that event, agreed to look to England as to a country raised, in a manner, by the strokes of Providence itself, to

The Scottish Review

be a judge and a ruler over the tribes of Christendom. For her enjoyment of this sort of prosperity, the best, surely, that can befall any kingdom or empire, England was principally indebted to the large and tolerant ideas enunciated by her "philosophic Radicals." Fully conscious of the questionable means by which their country's vast dominions had been procured; determined foes to wars, aggression, and jingoism; and justly suspicious alike of imperialism naked and unashamed as of the various disguises and subterfuges commonly employed to conceal from the public the real nature of that institution, which is, as it was in the beginning, is now, and will continue to be as long as it shall be known and tolerated among men, usurpation based on force, and maintained in existence by the same immoral means; these courageous men, we say, duly sensible of the danger to humanity of all forms of empires whose sanction is immediately or remotely derived from armed power, and determined enemies to the prevailing vice of the English democracy, which is hypocrisy, strove zealously and unremittingly, and, in a large measure, successfully, to bring off their country from its attachment to the notions and maxims of Caesarism, and to render its imperial rule and system relatively respectable, and as little injurious as possible. No words were ever minced by Bentley and his school in addressing the English public. In his appeal for universal peace and disarmament, "you," he cries, "*have been the greatest sinners,*" and he insists that his own countrymen should, for that reason, take the lead in that general movement which then, as now, was designed to carry into effect

The English Empire and the Future

the underlying tenets of the Christian religion. " You are the strongest among nations (he continues), though justice be not on your side, force is ; and it is your force that has been the main cause of your injustice."

In the present war, the rulers of Europe have seen fit to engage, by force, the pride and flower of the manhood of the most considerable nations of Christendom. No one can justly say that the democracies of Europe have gone voluntarily into the conflict. Exists there a jingo so meticulously true to the archi-type of all imbecility and barbarity as to have the front to maintain that had this war of very wars been put to the popular vote, the democracies of Europe had deliberately determined on the destruction of millions of their own kith and kin ? It is on the heads of the rulers and the ruling classes of Europe that the blood of the sacrificed lies ; yes, on the heads of every single one of them, no matter whether they be, or were, merely passive spectators of the hideous system by means of which imperialism generates the dark and sinister forces that are necessary to its existence, or have played a more bloody and guilty part in fomenting those forces so as to draw them the more rapidly and effectually to their certain ends. But, if against their every will and inclination, the democracies of Europe have been compelled to destroy one another, let not their rulers hug the delusion to themselves that the People is merely so much food for powder, and that (to change the figure) it will be content to be flung aside like a squeezed orange when it shall come to a question of casting the lines of the new Europe that will arise as soon as the " killing times " shall have passed

The Scottish Review

away. The rulers have called the tune, whose name is Death and Destruction, and the People has been compelled to dance to it. The same deluded and unhappy victim is still footing it, with broken heart and bleeding feet. Doubtless, the People has no choice but to continue to cut those dismal capers till the hellish sound dies down, and the fell Piper is called off ; but, when the proper time shall come, we hope that the democracies of the world will unite to destroy that Piper and his employers. "There'll never be peace till Jamie comes hame," was the constant burden of a well-known Jacobite lament. There will be no rest for the universe till the poison of imperialism is expelled from the body politic.¹ The two great historians from whose works we have already quoted, namely, Robertson and Gibbon, were, as becomes men of learning, lively parts, and humane sentiments, determined enemies to that system whose genius, workings, and ramifications, they made

¹ In his recent Birkenhead speech, Mr. Lloyd George committed himself to the astounding absurdity that great empires are necessary to the well-being of mankind, a form of imbecility from which the present spectacle of a Europe overturned and drenched with blood by reason of the same should have preserved him, allowing that his knowledge of history is so contemptible that, under different conditions, it were vain to expect of him any less ridiculous statement. With the same breath with which Mr. Lloyd George affirmed his belief in empires, that unique platform performer solemnly blessed the cause of the little nations ! The explanation of this paradox, whimsical as it must seem, is to be found in the fact that the recent Pan-Celtic Conference at Birkenhead struck a decidedly anti-imperialistic note. News of this was carried to Mr. George, the gorge of whose new-found imperialism rose at the expense of his intelligence (and that of his audience) in the surprising and tragic fashion referred to above.

The English Empire and the Future

it their peculiar province to explore. "The dominion of the Romans, like that of all great empires, degraded and debased the human species," said the first. The opinion of the second is no less emphatic. "There is nothing perhaps (he says in one place) more adverse to nature and reason than to hold in obedience remote countries and foreign nations in opposition to their inclination and interest." And in another, these are his words when referring to the *Pax Romana* and the specious appearances which that false security produced—"The uniform government of the Romans introduced a slow and secret poison into the vitals of the empire. The minds of men were gradually reduced to the same level; the fire of genius was extinguished." The complete suppression of this dangerous system of rule should, then, be the price exacted of their rulers in part requital of the enormous sacrifices made by the democracies of Europe, by reason of their forced participation in the present war. Proffers, no matter from what source they may hail, of "reparation," "indemnities," and "securities," which are plainly inconsistent with the complete destruction of imperialism, should be laughed to scorn by the democracies of Europe. They should insist on the complete undoing of the whole system which has brought so many hundreds of thousands of them to untimely graves. They should demand and procure the everlasting disgrace of the *bourgeois* politicians, styling themselves Statesmen, whose account is in war and imperialism, and who, whether accessories before or after the bloody fact which has reduced the fairest parts of Europe to

The Scottish Review

one vast charnel house, are not only guilty of the blood of millions of their fellow-men, but have caused more tears to flow, and hearts to break than, probably, all past generations of conquerors ("the most noxious of all animals," as Bolingbroke justly stigmatises them), of whose exploits authentic history supplies us with any record, succeeded in doing.¹

We hope, then, that when the war shall come to an end, Democracy will exact to the full that price for its forced participation therein which it is now beginning to cast up. Imperialism must go; and with it will necessarily depart one of the capital causes of quarrels, and incivility and ignorance among nations, namely, armaments, which impoverish, while they barbarise, the people. It was from the writings of the Spanish Jesuits of the time of Henry IV. of France that Rousseau derived the most considerable of his ideas, and the parentage of the one to which we are now about to call our readers' attention can be easily traced back to that source, by any that are conversant with the opinions of those able and industrious professors of Liberty and Freedom. "A very superficial view of political societies (says Rousseau) will be sufficient to convince us that the greater part of their imperfections springs from the necessity of devoting to their external security those cares and those means which ought to have been devoted to their internal development." What "starves" education all over Europe, and conspires to keep the Sovereign People in slavish sub-

¹ If some men have been deified for the good, many have been so for the hurt, they did; and conquerors, the most noxious of all animals, have become objects of adoration."—*Philosophical Works.*

The English Empire and the Future

jection to their subjects and servants, their rulers? Armaments. Education is the rock on which the new Europe must be raised. By the light of that lamp must the footsteps of the future be guided. It is by means of that precious balm that the wounds and sores of the old will be rendered the flesh perfect of the new international dispensation. It was Le Play who said that, "every new generation is just an invasion of young barbarians that must be educated and trained." We require money to civilise our youthful savages. To hold the predatory language of the present English Premier, armaments constitute "the hen-roost" into which the people must break, and which the people must plunder.

That man is little to be esteemed a visionary who, observing the rising tide of general indignation and hatred of war, and its capital fomenting causes, should prognosticate that with the end of the struggle in which Christendom is now engaged there will come the downfall of imperialism. Day by day, nay, hour by hour, are the popular will and the popular resolve visibly hardening in this respect. From the womb of the future there issues the voice of posterity, crying loudly and appealingly for the utter destruction of the means of destruction, and for the total abrogation of that iniquitous system of rule which deliberately prostitutes wealth and human intelligence to the multiplication and improvement of the weapons and engines of international slaughter. Independently altogether of the rage and indignation which are filling the hearts of the people of Europe, just as some vast river that has burst its banks diffuses its irresistible flood over the

The Scottish Review

surface of the land, the sound of that voice crying in the wilderness of the unknown should alone suffice to stir up the present generation to make this indeed that which, when it began, it was proclaimed to be in some quarters not easy to be associated with political candour and plain dealing, namely, a "War to end War." On a review of past sacrifices, too numerous to be numbered, and too poignant to be detailed, and considering our present intolerable load of miseries and misfortunes, and the future inevitable sufferings to which society will be reduced in consequence of the war, it is difficult to conceive that modern Democracy should, in the event, prove itself false to the duty which humanity and its own principles unite to charge upon it. It is difficult to conceive that, having definitely set its hand to the plough, the foot of Democracy should now draw back, and cravenly quit the furrow on which it has entered, with the design of driving the share through the heart of the roots of militarism. But should such an unspeakable, and well-nigh unthinkable, calamity befall mankind ; should the peoples of Europe allow themselves to be in the future that which they have tamely submitted to be in the past, namely, the silly slaves of designing rulers, and consent to a peace which shall violate the first tenets of the European Revolution ; even in that event, disgraceful and inexpressibly melancholy though it would be, the dark cloud of which we speak would not be without a silver lining. Come weal, come woe, thus much at least is a certain outcome of the present war, namely, the everlasting disgrace of the Centralist system of rule, and the

The English Empire and the Future

speedy dissolution of all surviving forms of "diluted" imperialism through the agency of those seeds of destruction which, in the event of the occurrence of the second of the two contingencies which we have faced, the inevitable change from Centralisation to Federalism will introduce into their bowels. Caesar is dead or dying (it now matters little which)—let Democracy flourish, and live for ever!

The English Empire was formed about 1760; flourished during the greatest part of the nineteenth century; and was begun to be assumed into universal Federalism in the year 1917.



Scottish Trade Unionists and Industrial Unrest

HE report of the Commission appointed to "inquire into and report upon industrial unrest" can scarcely be described as a sensational document.

With pontifical ponderosity, the Commissioners have told us one or two things which most people knew before—that there is deep-rooted unrest among large sections of the industrial population, that this discontent is due in great measure to high food prices in relation to wages, to well-founded suspicions of profiteering, to serious restrictions of personal freedom, particularly under the Munitions Act, to the growing distrust of the Government, to the harsh and inequitable operation of the Military Service Acts, and to the muddling and blundering of a slow-footed and incompetent bureaucracy. It is quite true that the conclusions of the Commissioners are not expressed quite as explicitly or so emphatically as I have summarised them, but all these things are clearly implied in the report, which confirms the impressions of impartial observers of industrial affairs and of those who are in close touch with working-class movements.

That a Government which pays £20,000 a year to Trade Union officials and ex-officials for expert guidance in labour affairs should find it necessary to set up a special commission to report on matters with

Scottish T.U.'s and Industrial Unrest

which their responsible advisers ought to be perfectly familiar will strike most people as a wasteful and round-about way of arriving at the truth. Such, however, are the methods of bureaucracy. The report will, nevertheless, serve one or two very useful purposes. It will direct public attention to the admitted grievances of the working-classes, to the failure of the Government to stamp out profiteering, to the staggering burden which the war has imposed on the mass of the people, to the bankruptcy of militarism, and to the failure of the mailed fist as means of settling international differences. Even more than all these things it emphasises the ignominious failure of bureaucracy—of the attempt to govern Scotland, as well as England, from Whitehall and Downing Street.

To Scottish Nationalists the report of the Commissioners for Scotland is particularly interesting. The Scottish Commissioners were Sheriff T. A. Fyfe (Chairman), Mr. Noel E. Peck, and Mr. A. G. Cameron.

It is probably not a brilliant combination—certainly not a combination noted for its democratic leanings, although Mr. Cameron has a creditable record in the Trade Union movement. Under these circumstances it is scarcely surprising that the Scottish report is notable rather for the things that are left unsaid than for the specific findings of the Commissioners. For example, one of the root causes of the war-time troubles in Scotland is not even remotely hinted at by the Commissioners. I refer to the failure of the English political leaders—and particularly of Mr. Lloyd George—to understand the organised labour movement in Scotland, and the temperament of the working-classes

The Scottish Review

of the north. That failure has had a very serious effect on the industrial situation.

Three years ago when it became apparent that the war was developing into a stupendous conflict of machinery—that the issue would depend on the loyal co-operation of the engineers and shipyard workers as much as on the heroism of the men on the battle-field—the direct intervention of the Government in industrial affairs began. That intervention was, perhaps, necessary, but it has been in many respects injudicious and ill-advised. Mr. Lloyd-George, in particular, has been unfortunate in his relations with the organised labour movement. It is evident that he labours under a complete misapprehension as to the relations between the members of Trade Unions and their officials. As Mr. W. C. Anderson, M.P., says, in an able communication to the *Daily News* :—

He (Mr. Lloyd George) thought of the organised Labour movement in terms of a political caucus where a few leaders pull the strings and set the many puppets dancing. Get these leaders into a conference-room behind closed doors, explain to them the needs for drastic restrictions on industrial liberty, carry them off their feet in a burst of generous emotion, and all was well. Some Trade Union leaders (not all by any means) were apparently willing that that view of the position should prevail, since among other things it greatly magnified their own importance. The man frequently overlooked or forgotten at these interesting conclaves was the man in the factory on whom the burden of the sacrifice fell. That man has been protesting vigorously against being disposed of without his knowledge or consent. He insists that he must be a consenting party to bargains that affect his industrial status. He objects to bureaucracy, whether it be the bureaucracy of a Government department or a Trade Union executive. His discontent is evidence of the general unrest.

Thus, in a few pregnant sentences, Mr. Anderson

Scottish T.U.'s and Industrial Unrest

puts his finger on the fatal flaw in Mr. Lloyd George's industrial policy. He has regarded the organised workers as sheep to be driven whither he wills, at the bidding of their own paid officials and the barking of the muzzled dogs of the gramophone press. Those who are familiar with the internal working of the organised Labour movement know that the Prime Minister's conception of Trade Union methods is a grotesque travesty of the actual facts. No one who has been present at a Scottish Trade Union meeting would have been guilty of such a blunder. Scottish trade unionists insist, and rightly insist, on the democratic control of the affairs of their own organisation. They may be willing, in the hour of common peril, to surrender certain of their hard-won privileges, but they will do so only when the reasons for the suspension of Trade Union regulations have been made clear to them—not because their officials have pulled the strings at the dictation of Downing Street. Harsh experience has also taught them during the past three eventful years that many of the restrictions on personal and industrial freedom are not only unnecessary, but unwarrantably vexatious and provocative, and create far more unrest than they cure. The prevalence of industrial unrest is a convincing proof of the failure of the Prime Minister's policy—the coercion of labour.

It must be frankly admitted that the Scottish trade unionists have not been entirely free from blame themselves in this matter. In some of the great trade organisations there has recently sprung up a system of bureaucracy which may prove as serious a menace to Scottish national aspirations as the centralised con-

The Scottish Review

trol of Imperial affairs. The arguments in favour of "Home Rule," or autonomy, for Scottish trade unionists are just as strong, just as unanswerable, as the arguments in favour of self-government in the great affairs of the State. Centralisation in London is equally as objectionable in connection with Trade Unions as in connection with administrative and parliamentary matters. And yet Scottish Labour leaders—staunch democrats all of them!—have permitted this objectionable system to spring up in their own organisations with scarcely a murmur or a protest. The result is that progressive opinion in Scotland is frequently stifled and stultified by the reactionary mass on the other side of the Tweed. The notorious "hold-up" of the Pacifist delegates by the "National" Seamen and Firemen's Union was a case in point. The record of the egregious "Captain" Tupper calls for no comment; it is sufficiently well-known in the Trade Union movement. So, too, is that of his chief, Mr. Havelock Wilson. No one pretends for a moment that the frothy ebullitions of these self-styled patriots represent the opinions of the thoughtful working men and women of the North. The seamen and firemen of Glasgow have repudiated the claims of the Wilson-Tupper gang to speak in the name of the sailors of Scotland. Responsible Scottish Labour organisations have emphatically condemned the mob orators who, by misrepresentation and calumny, succeeded for a time in delaying the fraternal visit of prominent Labour leaders to Russia, thus widening the breach, and creating fresh misunderstanding between the people of the United Kingdoms and the new Republic of the

Scottish T.U.'s and Industrial Unrest

East. But in spite of all this, an organisation, dominated by English jingoes who sleep snugly in their beds at home while other men do the fighting, succeeded in besmirching the working-class movement in Scotland. The Tupper "hold-up" is an ugly blot on the Trade Union record of Scotland, and is a glaring example of the pernicious effect of English bureaucracy in the organised Labour movement.

In another sphere one finds traces of the same sinister influence. The National Union of Railwaymen stands on a far higher level than the Seamen's Union. Its officials are men of an entirely different type from the Wilson-Tupper demagogues. Nevertheless, in matters relating to Scotland, reactionary English opinion frequently dominates the policy of the Railwaymen's Union. Witness the hostile reception accorded recently to the Scottish National Protest. While important Trade Unions, such as the Associated Ironmoulders of Scotland, emphatically endorsed the protest "against the pretended right of England to appear and speak in name and on behalf of Scotland at any International Congress," while prominent leaders of the Scottish Miners and the Scottish Farm Servants have been in the forefront of the movement, and while many Scottish Labour organisations have adhered to the principles laid down in the protest, the executive of the so-called "National" Union of Railwaymen curtly decline to identify themselves with the Scottish stand for the rights of nationality.¹ The

¹ Whilst it is true that the Executive (whose habitat is London) of the so-called "National" Union of Railwaymen has declined to endorse the Scottish National Protest; on the other hand,

The Scottish Review

decision is a significant one, and is another sinister example of London rule in the Trade Union movement. It is quite evident that though the Railwaymen's Union has recently changed its name it has not changed its characteristics. A king or commoner may change his name, but neither monarch nor beggar can change his grandfather. Nor does a Trade Union, by adding the word "National" to its name alter its constitution or its policy. The United Kingdoms consist not of one nation, but of four distinct Nationalties—Scottish, English, Welsh, and Irish—and the use of the word "National" in connection with the great Trade Unions is altogether misleading and unwarranted. Federal Government in the Trade Union movement (on the lines of the Miners' Federation), as well as in the affairs of the State, is the only sound basis of a truly national movement.

In another respect, too, Scottish trade unionists—I do not say all of them, but a considerable proportion of their number—are partly responsible for the London domination, of which complaint is made in the report on industrial unrest. They have themselves helped to fashion the chains which bind them. They have shouted with the flag-waving patriots. Were they not citizens of that glorious "British Empire" on which the sun never sets—and the tax-gatherer never goes to bed? Blatchford and Bottomley were their high priests, and their gospel the frothy farragoes and

the Scottish members of that body have supported it, thus sharply dissociating themselves from their Sasunnach Executive.—Editor, *Scottish Review*.

Scottish T.U.'s and Industrial Unrest

fatuities of *John Bull*. Even in more responsible circles, the Scottish national movement has not always received that sympathetic support to which its importance entitles it. Vague ideals of internationalism—admirable in themselves — not infrequently overshadowed the more urgent claims of the National movement. Representative trade unionists proclaimed themselves "citizens of the world," forgetting that they were at the same time citizens of Scotland. "The world is my country," they declared, forgetting the claims of the land that bore them. The vital truth is—as I have more than once insisted in the pages of the *Scottish Review*—that Nationalism and Internationalism are not antagonistic or incompatible ideals. Far from it. Internationalism is the flower and complement of Nationalism. International ideals can only be adequately expressed and given effect to by means of Nationalism. As Bebel says, "Internationalism does not mean superseding the spirit of nationality, but reconciling and completing its aims."

In connection with arbitration proceedings under the Munitions Act, the London Control and centralised administration, to which I have referred, have given rise to a considerable amount of friction and unrest. This aspect of the failure of bureaucracy is rightly emphasised by the Scottish Commissioners.

The best that can be said of the Munitions of War Act is that it is a necessary evil. No Scottish workman pretends that he is proud of his badge of servitude, for he realises that the present regime, with its drastic restrictions of individual freedom, is a very thinly veiled form of industrial slavery. "Wha sae base

The Scottish Review

as be a slave"—let him seek employment in a "Controlled Establishment." At the same time, the difficulties and hardships inevitable in war time would have been faced cheerfully had the burden been distributed equitably over the whole community, and had the Munitions Act been administered in a tolerant, enlightened spirit, and without undue procrastination or irritating dilatoriness.

The conclusions of the Commissioners on this point may be thus summarised :—

The existing system of arbitration with its—perhaps to a large extent inevitable—delay and expense is cited as a cause of unrest, more especially as regards small and local differences, which, when neglected, have a tendency to grow into big differences and to create irritation and unrest. It is pointed out that, unfortunately, there is a growing feeling amongst workmen that they cannot get differences promptly dealt with unless they strike or threaten to do so, and that the existence of this feeling gives countenance to the tactics of a section amongst the workers who would, but that they are prevented by the Munitions Act, counsel resort to a strike under all circumstances. The remedy suggested is that the arbitration scheme of the Munitions Act should be decentralised ; that, instead of everything being reported to London, and arbitration proceedings being initiated from London, differences should in the first place be dealt with on the spot by a permanent local court of arbitration, and should be settled locally, unless in the course of the proceedings it appears that questions of more than local interest are involved, when they could be remitted to the Central Arbitration Board. As it is estimated that at least 50 per cent. of the trade disputes which arise are purely local, and often small differences, this would greatly relieve the over-burdened Department of the Chief Industrial Commissioner and lessen the delay in dealing with large differences which affect a whole trade or industry.

The Commissioners suggest that the new Munitions Bill affords a convenient opportunity for effecting this change in arbitration procedure ; but they reject the suggestion that the settlement of differences in this manner should be tacked on to the duties of local

Scottish T.U.'s and Industrial Unrest

munitions tribunals, because the procedure before these tribunals is not appropriate for obtaining a decision which, to be of any practical use, must have the legal effect of an award, and also, and chiefly, because the selection of assessors would be an exceedingly important element in the success of such local arbitration courts, and they must be selected for each case because of a special knowledge of the trade in which the particular dispute arises.

All this is on fairly sound lines, so far as it goes. The evils of bureaucracy are emphasised, and the need for decentralisation is insisted on, but the claim of Scottish workmen and Scottish employers to settle their own disputes without the intervention of London might have been stated more firmly and more explicitly. Under the present arrangement delays of six, eight, ten weeks, and even longer in the settlement of minor differences are of quite common occurrence, and the friction thus occasioned is a fruitful source of unrest and misunderstanding. A great deal of good work has been done recently by certain Scottish sheriffs acting as arbiters in industrial disputes, and purely local differences under the Munitions Act might quite easily be dealt with in the same simple fashion. The basic principle of the scheme, however, should be Scottish control of all arbitration in connection with Scottish Labour disputes. Only thus will it be possible to abolish, or to limit effectively, the system of centralised muddledom and London control of which complaint is made not in Scotland only, but in English provincial centres as well. Decentralisation is the keynote of successful administration ; and, so far as Scotland is concerned decentralisation in this case takes the form of the institution of an arbitration scheme on national lines. So far as details are con-

The Scottish Review

cerned there is probably no need for a hard and fast scheme on the lines suggested by the Commissioners. It may safely, and advantageously, be left to the parties immediately concerned to select their own arbiters—either a Standing Committee, an independent and mutual adjudicator, such as the Sheriff of the district, or a committee of experts familiar with the details of the industry concerned. That, in practice, has been found to be the most satisfactory method of securing a harmonious settlement of industrial differences.

But the bungling of the bureaucrats is but one of the causes of Labour-unrest. Fiercer and more ominous is the storm of indignation that has been aroused by the profiteering scandals and the serious inflation of food prices. The irritation on the part of the working-classes of the North has been accentuated by an accumulation of blunders on the part of the Food Controller and a mistaken and mischievous attempt to fix prices for Scotland on an English basis, and in conformity with English conditions. (That is another cause of unrest which has been overlooked by the Scottish Commissioners). Lord Devonport's oatmeal bungle was a glaring instance of the fatuous incompetence of English bureaucracy. All the world knows that the North-Eastern counties are the meal girnal of Scotland. Oats is the staple crop, and probably nowhere in the three kingdoms can meal be bought so cheaply as in Aberdeenshire, Banffshire, and the adjoining counties. The famous Midlothian oatmeal is only a shilling or two dearer per boll. The sources of supply are in close proximity to the big centres of industry, so that the railway rates do not add materially

Scottish T.U.'s and Industrial Unrest

to the cost of distribution. And yet prices were fixed on a scale which enabled English dealers to purchase large quantities of this staple article of food, convey it by rail to London and the big English centres, and there sell it at a profit at the same rate as Lord Devonport had fixed for Scotland. The price was determined solely by English conditions ; that is to say prices which may have been reasonable in London in view of the heavier railway charges for carriage and the difficulties of distribution, became oppressive and exorbitant when applied to Scotland. As a matter of fact the Food Controller's prices—which, by a polite fiction, were understood to be fixed for the purpose of stopping profiteering—were substantially higher than those ruling in Scotland when the Devonport scale came into operation. The result was that prices, even in the heart of the oat-growing districts, rapidly approximated to the high London level, while, at a time of marked food scarcity, Scotland was denuded of enormous quantities of the oatmeal which was once despised by the Sasunnach. Scotland was penalised in order that England might have cheaper oatmeal ! That was Scotland's first experience of the bureaucrat's attempt to check profiteering by means of artificially-fixed prices. To say that it was a ludicrous bungle is perhaps the most charitable interpretation that one can place upon the incident.

Equally notorious was the Devonport potato muddle ; indeed the super-grocer—a typical representative of the much-puffed-up "business Government"—continued to add blunder on blunder and failure on failure until even the patient dupes cried, " Hold,

The Scottish Review

enough!" and, to the undisguised relief even of his friends, the Food Controllership passed into other hands. Lord Rhondda, it is true, has avoided some of the worst mistakes of his predecessors, but the control of prices is still vitiated by the same pernicious principle as that which made the Devonport regime a butt for ridicule in the North. Prices in Scotland are still determined very largely by conditions which obtain in England. Witness the new Milk Order, which has evoked strong protests from several local Food Control Committees.

Scottish farmers are able to hold their own with competitors from any part of the world; they require no State bonus to enable them to obtain a remunerative return from the land. In enterprise and up-to-date methods they leave the English agriculturists ignorantly behind. They have done amazingly well during the three terrible years of war, and that too at a time when many other sections of the community were undergoing serious privations and hardships. I make no attempt to acquit them of the charge of profiteering; during the "fat years" their profits have mounted up in a fashion that astonished even themselves. At the same time Scottish farmers have legitimate grounds for complaint against the Food Controller. Prices for cattle, or rather for butcher meat, have in this case, too, been fixed in accordance with English conditions. The high price of feeding stuffs hits the Northern farmer harder than it does his English rival; moreover, no adequate attempt has been made to discriminate between the finer descriptions of Scottish beef and the coarser kinds which are produced more extensively in England and Ireland.

Scottish T.U.'s and Industrial Unrest

Much more serious is the blow that has been struck at Scottish agriculture by the Food Controller's order, which has just come into operation, fixing the maximum price of meat in September at 74/- per live cwt.; in October at 72/-; November and December, 67/-; and in January at 60/-. All this, of course, is in keeping with the decree of the Government that a substantial reduction of live stock must be effected within the next few months. The result of the Food Controller's short-sighted ukase is precisely what might have been anticipated. Cattle are being rushed on to the market in order that farmers may profit by the restricted period of high prices. There has been an enormous slaughter of immature stock, with the result that there is bound to be, sooner or later, a serious shortage of good cattle all over the country. In Scotland—where farmers in the past have specialised in the production of high-quality beef, and where the inflated price of feeding stuffs will be acutely felt—the action of the Food Controller may have far-reaching effects on the principal industry of the country. Stop profiteering by all means—much more drastic action than has yet been taken is fully warranted—but let every care be taken that arbitrary action does not do more harm than good, and place a permanent check on the cattle trade of Scotland.

With all these blunders of the Food Controller, and their effects on national life and on the industries of the country, observant Scotsmen cannot fail to be familiar. I recall the incidents, however, for the purpose of emphasising the grave dangers which are involved in the present policy of regulating Scottish

The Scottish Review

prices from London and in conformity with English conditions. The appointment of a Scottish Food Controller—familiar with conditions in the Northern Kingdom, and in close touch with our national life—is the only satisfactory solution of the difficulty.

One other aspect of the problem of food control demands consideration from the Scottish National point of view, at this juncture. I refer to the position of the Scottish farm servants under the Government scheme for increasing food production. There is no need to discuss in detail the principles on which the Corn Production Act is based. That scarcely comes within our purview at present. Suffice it to say that, so far as Scotland is concerned, the guarantees are wholly unnecessary, while it is very doubtful if the costly and cumbrous scheme will increase the production of food in the North by a single chalder. The aftermath of war—the shortage of food throughout Europe, indeed throughout the world—will ensure remunerative prices for the farmers for many a long day to come. At a time when our lads from Scottish straths and glens are fighting and dying in France and Flanders, a wholly unnecessary Bill for the purpose of enabling the farmers and land-owners to dip their hands still deeper in the public purse is piloted through Parliament in brazen-faced fashion by a Liberal and Tory combine.

The point to which I wish to draw attention, however, is the clumsy but ineffective attempt which was made in connection with the Corn Production Act to regulate the wages of the Scottish farm workers on the English basis. Even before the outbreak of the war there was a marked disparity between the wages

Scottish T.U.'s and Industrial Unrest

of farm labourers in Scotland and England. In England, agriculture for generations past has been one of the sweated industries ; in Scotland the wages of the farm-workers in the best-paid counties approximate very closely to the earnings of skilled artisans—and quite rightly so. In England, before the outbreak of the war, wages in some of the poorer-paid localities were as low as 14/- and 15/- per week. Even after three years of unparalleled struggle, when statesmen were proclaiming that the war would be won by the plough, and in spite of the serious inflation of prices—wages in many districts in England were still appreciably under the £1 margin. Under these circumstances there was probably a fairly strong case for a minimum wage in England, although the methods of fixing and enforcing the standard are open to grave objection. The 30/- minimum, proposed by the Labour Party, is certainly very moderate in the circumstances, and it is to the everlasting discredit of certain reputed Labour Ministers that they rejected this higher standard and voted for the 25/- minimum put forward by the Government.

Thus far, thus bad ; but there was worse to follow. With blundering ineptitude and ignorance of, or indifference to, the actual situation north of the Tweed, the Government proposed to apply the 25/- minimum to Scotland as well as to England. Against this the farm servants of Scotland made indignant protest. Wages in Scotland, inclusive of allowances, are at least 10/- per week above the Government minimum. In the best paid districts—Forfar, Perth, Kincardine, and the adjoining counties—the earnings of the farm-workers

The Scottish Review

are approximately £2 per week. That an attempt should have been made by the Government to introduce the 25/- minimum under such conditions is merely another instance of the pernicious methods of English bureaucracy—of the attempt to govern Scotland from London. The proposal was an insult to Scotland and to Scottish ploughmen. Happily the plot miscarried. This satisfactory issue was due in great measure to the vigorous and skilfully-organised campaign of the Scottish ploughmen, and in particular to the ability with which their case was conducted by Mr. Joseph F. Duncan, the energetic hon. secy. of the Union. An amendment—drafted by the Scottish Farm Servants' Union—was put down by Mr. J. R. Macdonald, a loyal and trusted friend of the farm labourers, and was supported by practically the whole of the Scottish members present, and eventually accepted by the Government. By this amendment, agreements arrived at between the Union and the local farmers' societies have virtually the effect of Wage Board decisions. The result is a notable triumph for Scottish national sentiment, as well as for the Scottish Farm Servants' Union, and forms a splendid example to the trade unionists of the north of what can be done by national unity and organisation.

And now we come to another aspect of the industrial unrest. In this case, too, the matter is glossed over by the Scottish Commissioners, although in the main report it is summed up under the heading "lack of confidence in the Government." That lack of confidence is much more deeply rooted than the Commissioners seem to imagine, and is not confined

Scottish T.U.'s and Industrial Unrest

to uneasiness in regard to the restoration of Trade Union conditions. To an increasing extent the whole public policy of the Government in regard to the war is being seriously challenged. There is a growing rift between the Government and the democratic sentiment of the community. That the Asquith Government failed to keep the peace may have been their misfortune rather than their fault; that the Lloyd-George-Churchill-Northcliffe combine has been guilty of grave blunders admits of no manner of dispute. So tactless, provocative, and insolently offensive have some of the Prime Minister's outbursts been that it is exceedingly doubtful whether under his auspices the war can be brought to a successful termination. His allegation of slacking and drunkenness among the working-classes—evils which were "doing us more damage in the war than all the German submarines put together"—was an insult to Labour. Equally crude and tactless were his jeers at the rabbit-like methods of the German army and the Churchill jibe about "digging out the rats." These jeers have been re-echoed day after day by the scribes of the gutter press. It is probably quite true the German junkers—or a section of them—have been equally offensive in their references to the Allies. It is highly discreditable and deplorable, nevertheless, that the "statesmen" of all the belligerent nations should be taunting, jeering, and insulting each other—after the manner of rival bands of street urchins—while all the time the life-blood of Europe is ebbing away on the battle-fields of Flanders. That, indeed, is a humiliating spectacle. It is time for all this fooling to cease. If the statesmen

The Scottish Review

of the belligerent nations cannot get on with the war, then in Heaven's name let them begin to talk of peace.

Rightly or wrongly there is a growing feeling amongst the working-classes of Scotland that the war on the Western front is drifting towards a stalemate, and that negotiations must take the place of the mailed fist before a durable peace can be established. Three years ago, when the dogs of war were let loose, I insisted, in the pages of the *Scottish Review*—in opposition to the public sentiment of the hour—that militarism will never smash militarism. That has now become sufficiently clear even to the dullest dotard; to-day the frenzied advocates of militarism are beating their idol and angrily asking why it has not saved them. Discerning eyes can already see the impending failure of militarism. Certainly M. Bloch's theory as to the tremendous strength of the defensive in modern warfare has been amply justified by what has happened on the Western front since August, 1914. The Allies may—and no doubt will—deliver heavy and even staggering blows on the German front, but the frothy, war-drunk multitudes is sobered and serious now, and one hears no more of the Grand March through Germany, culminating in the singing of the "Marseillaise" in the streets of Berlin. The braggarts on both sides of the Rhine are silent now, save perhaps those loud-mouthed demagogues who voice their opinions through the gramaphone press, and one or two of the less reputable class of politicians.

In all the belligerent nations the feeling is growing that if the discredited statesmen of to-day—the men who made the war—fail to make a satisfactory peace,

Scottish T.U.'s and Industrial Unrest

then the working men of Europe must themselves undertake that stupendous task. A stupendous task it will be. A handful of blundering diplomats may plunge Europe into Armageddon, but the establishment of a just and durable peace will demand the patient efforts and generous co-operation of the best minds and the most trusted representatives of all the belligerent powers. That is why one welcomes so cordially the Russian proposal to convene a Great International Labour Conference at Stockholm. Stockholm, notwithstanding the foolish declarations of the Yellow Press, is not dead. Stockholm may yet sound the death-knell of secret diplomacy, and herald the beginning of the democratic control of foreign affairs. That, no doubt, explains the frantic efforts which are being made by the bureaucrats in France and Italy, as well as in England, to strangle the new democratic movement by refusing passports to the Labour and Socialist delegates.

Among the working-classes of Scotland, feeling in favour of an International Conference (whether at Stockholm or elsewhere matters but little) is surprisingly strong. Men who have but little sympathy with socialistic aspirations declare that—seeing the Government after three years of conflict has failed to secure an honourable peace—the representatives of Labour and Democracy might well be given an opportunity of showing the world a more excellent way. Peace—an early peace—has now become the one great supreme need of European civilisation. Convincing proof of the attitude of the Scottish workmen toward the International Conference, and all that it implies, is to be

The Scottish Review

found in the remarkable unanimity with which the trade unionists have supported the proposal. Even after Mr. Arthur Henderson had been expelled from the Cabinet because—all honour to him!—he placed principle before expediency, and loyalty to Labour before the emoluments of office, the voice of the working classes of Scotland was given clearly and unmistakably in favour of Stockholm. Mr. Lloyd George's unworthy and virulent attack on a former colleague failed to sway the vote of the Scottish trade unionists. The Scottish miners gave a solid vote for Stockholm. So, too, did the steel-smelters, the railwaymen, and the shop assistants on both sides of the Tweed—and that, too, in defiance of some of their own officials who are members of the Government. So far as Scotland is concerned, there is not the slightest doubt that feeling among trade unionists is overwhelmingly in favour of the International Conference.

It is quite possible that when the proposal to hold an International Conference is again brought forward the Government will refuse passports to the delegates. The bureaucrats, one may rest assured, will cling in frenzied fashion to their vanishing vestiges of power. They realise—if their dupes among the working-class fail to do so—that the International Conference will sound the death-knell of secret diplomacy. It has done so already. Militarist Governments may ban the conference, but interchange of opinion on the great issues of peace and war between the representatives of European democracy has already begun, although in indirect and circuitous fashion, and no power on earth can stay the progress of the new internationalism which even now is being established in Europe.

Scottish T.U.'s and Industrial Unrest

It may even be the case that the Government, when they can no longer withstand the pressure of public opinion, will climb down from their pedestal of arrogance, grant the delegates passports with the best possible grace, and then—as they have done before—rely on their confederates of the Wilson-Tupper gang to defy the voice of Labour and Democracy in Scotland and England. But a cause which relies on such men and such methods is already fore-doomed to failure.

Our survey on the report on industrial unrest in Scotland has been necessarily incomplete. It has not been possible to deal adequately with the friction caused by the harsh and inequitable operation of the Military Service Acts, and the unrest occasioned by housing difficulties in certain parts of Scotland, by industrial fatigue, and the petty persecutions of domineering officials. (To the credit of the working-men of Scotland be it said “No complaint has been made in any quarter of the liquor restrictions being a cause of industrial unrest.”) My purpose has rather been to examine the main features of the report from the point of view of Scottish Nationalism—profiteering, London centralisation, and the growing mistrust of the Government. In particular I have felt it necessary to draw attention to certain causes of unrest which have been either overlooked or glossed over by the Scottish Commissioners.

We have seen that the Prime Minister has failed to understand the national temperament of Scotland, that the attempt to control Scottish industrial affairs from London has proved a failure and has been a

The Scottish Review

fruitful source of discontent and friction, and that Scottish control of Scottish industry has now become imperative.

We have seen that bureaucracy in the Trade Union movement has become a menace to Scottish Labour.

We have seen that, under the present system of food control, Scotland has been victimised repeatedly by the rigid application of English standards to both the Kingdoms, and that the appointment of a Food Controller for Scotland is the most satisfactory solution of the present difficulties.

We have seen that in Scotland, as elsewhere, there is growing dissatisfaction with the Government, and that in Trade Union circles the movement in favour of the democratic control of foreign affairs is growing in strength daily. In this respect, the ideals and aspirations of Scottish Nationalism and Scottish Labour are in complete harmony. There is no antagonism between Nationalism and Internationalism. They are part of the same great movement for the emancipation of humanity from the thraldom of militarism and effete bureaucracy—from the grip of the cosmopolitan plotters and financiers. The depredations of the profiteers will not end when the thunder of the cannon ceases. The reorganisation of European society on a democratic basis must proceed side by side with the new movement for the overthrow of militarism. In these great tasks Nationalism and Internationalism must both play their parts. Scottish Nationalists and Scottish trade unionists—representatives all of Scottish democracy—thus meet on common ground.

WILLIAM DIACK.

Empire : Maker of War.

Lonely, and infinitely small, she sails
This tortured earth whose soil is moist with blood ;
Only a bubble in the celestial flood,
A tear-drop driven before eternal gales.
But ours she is ; and though our reason quails
Before the tree of which we are a bud,
It is ours also. Stars are not mere mud ;
And to the soul who hears, the Universe wails.

Sorrow has come ; the helpless can but weep ;
For mighty lands are wrestling with death.
Engines of murder drown the thunder's roar ;
And men, made in God's image, die like sheep
To please the Imperial maniac who saith :—
“ Though I hold much, yet shall I grasp for more.”

HERBERT MOORE PIM.

[From *Selected Poems*, published by The Candle Press,
Dublin].



Scotland at Westminster

HE history of Scottish politics at Westminster in the two centuries which have elapsed since the coming into force of the unconstitutional Union of 1707 is not a subject likely to inspire the slightest respect for any but a negligible minority of those who took part in those proceedings. It is a record in no way creditable to Scotland, and one that many would wish to consign to oblivion. On the other hand, a brief sketch of Scottish parliamentarianism may serve to provide a few useful lessons at the present time.

After the passing, by means the illegality of which is well known, of the pretended Act of Union, two courses were open. The Scottish Parliament was not dissolved, still less abolished; it was merely adjourned. It could legally meet again—for that matter, it could do so now—and the members, or at any rate the loyal and unbribed minority, could have addressed themselves to the work of legislation. Any opposition from the Queen could have been disregarded, for that incompetent figurehead, by supporting and consenting to the Union, had overstepped her constitutional rights as Queen of Scots, and had thereby put herself in the same position as the opponents of James VII. considered that monarch to occupy in 1688-89.

If the Parliament had again assembled, that event would have been in the best interests of Scotland, and

Scotland at Westminster

would have been consistent with its past history in so far as refusing to bend the knee to England was concerned. Such a line of action would have commanded the enthusiastic support of almost the whole of the nation. That course, however, was not adopted. The second alternative was the plan that commended itself to the Scottish members of Parliament ; they went to Westminster, thus implicitly acknowledging the pretended right of the Westminster Parliament to legislate for Scotland. The pro-Union members were consistent in so doing ; not so, however, the anti-Union representatives.

It is a remarkable and little-known fact, that within a very short time after the Union, the Scottish members, of all shades of political opinion, were so disgusted by their experiences in the foreign Parliament that on more than one occasion they considered the plan of withdrawing from Westminster, and, further, that it was suggested at least once that the Scottish constituencies should elect members to stay at home and deliberate on the affairs of the nation, an anticipation in theory of the course actually adopted by the followers of Francis Deak, the Hungarian patriot, in the middle of the last century, and still more recently adopted by our fellow-Celts across the Moyle. Lockhart of Carnwath, one of the most determined opponents of the Union, was the protagonist of this policy. In a speech on the Treason Bill in 1709, he said, " perhaps a proposall may be made, which some gentlemen will, I hope, think necessary for the publick policy, that the forty-five Scots Commoners be directed to stay at home, and not attend the service of this House "

The Scottish Review

(*Lockhart Papers I.* 507). It may be interesting to follow the developments of this proposal. In connection with the debates in 1712 on the legal position of the Scots peers at Westminster, Bishop Burnet wrote :—"The Scotch (*sic*) lords, seeing no redress to their complaint, seemed resolved to come no more to sit in the House of Peers ; but the Court was sensible that their strength in that House consisted chiefly in them and in the new Peers, so pains were taken, and secret forcible arguments were used to them which proved so effectual that after a few days' absence they came back and continued during the session to sit in the House. They gave it out that an expedient would be found that would be to the satisfaction of the Peers of Scotland, but nothing of that appearing, it was concluded that the satisfaction was private and personal. The great arrear into which all the regular payments was left, to run made it to be generally believed that the income for the civil list was applied to other payments which the ministers durst not own. And though secret practice on members had been of a great while too common, yet it was believed that it was at this time managed with an extraordinary profusion " (*History of my Own Time*, VI. 105, second edition). The episcopal circumlocutions indicate with sufficient clearness that the Scots peers were bribed, just as happened in the case of the supporters of the Act of Union itself.

Again, in 1716, the Duke of Marr wrote :—"The people of Scotland, even those in the Government, are so provoked at the usage their country and countrymen meet with, that most of the Members of Parliament

Scotland at Westminster

from that country, as I am credibly informed, resolve to absent themselves this session of Parliament, in which resolution, if they persist, it will be a great diminution of the power of the Court in Parliament, which, if it begin once to fail, will produce such effects which are not looked for nor comprehended by those who know not perfectly that country" (*Stuart Papers* III. 255).

The Duke's information was apparently based, in part at any rate, on a letter to him from the Hon. Tom Bruce, in which it is stated that Lord Dalrymple "goes home immediately, and both designs and hopes that neither he himself nor any of Mr. Hewit's [Scotland's] family shall meddle with Mr. Johnston [House of Peers] or Mr. Johns [House of Commons] this year." (*Stuart Papers* III., 206). Of course, the explanatory words in brackets formed no part of the original letter. In view of the activities of English Government spies, it was necessary for the Jacobite agents to speak of many persons and things by other than their real names.

A later reference to the policy of withdrawal from Westminster is found in a letter of December 17th, 1724, from the heritors of Midlothian to their Member of Parliament the then Lord Advocate, Robert Dundas of Arniston. In view of the possible failure of the Scots members' protest against the ale tax, and after recording their opinion of that proposal, the writers state "wee doe require and expect that you will in the most solemn manner signify these our sentiments to the House of Commons, after which wee are of opinion there is no furder use for any representation

The Scottish Review

of the Scots in Parliament" (*Lockhart Papers* II. 139). About the same time, and in connection with the same proposals of the Government, Lockhart himself wrote as follows:—"Some methods were thought of to be followed out, in case the ministry had insisted on their first scheme [that of a tax on ale], particularly that such shyre and burrow shoud recall the right and power they had given their several representatives to sitt in the British Parliament, and *appoint new ones to meet and determine what course was to be taken for settling the nation*, now that the articles of the Union were so openly violated and consequently dissolved. The effects of which step were very obvious to make for the King [James VIII.], and I have good reason to think, from the tempers and inclinations of the people at that juncture, this measure might have been pursued had not the Ministry changed theirs; but tho' the malt tax was a burden too heavy to bear, it was not however illegall, and so did not afford an handle to work on as the first scheme" (*Lockhart Papers* II. 141). The reference in the last few sentences is to the substitution by the English ministry of a malt tax for their first proposal of a tax on ale.

Unfortunately for Scotland, the Lockhart policy, which we may perhaps call Scottish *Sinn Féin*, was never carried out. The gross venality and lack of patriotism of most of the politicians were the great obstacles to its adoption. The flesh pots of Westminster were too attractive for the politicians to cry off from them, and their English opponents well knew it. "They [the Scots members] threatened to leave the House. You will easily think they were not much believed as to that" (*Portland MSS.* VII. 392).

Scotland at Westminster

Let us now consider the doings and experiences of the Scottish members at Westminster in the years following the Union, a matter which in view of notions now loudly trumpeted in Fleet Street as to the sanctity of treaties may be interesting. It is always well to compare profession with practice, especially in the case of John Bull. The first "Parliament of Great Britain" met in October, 1707; its Scottish members had been selected by the predominant Court party of the Scots Parliament. Under these circumstances the majority was pro-Union. Many of the more important constituencies, such as the counties of Edinburgh, Fife and Stirling, were not represented at all. These constituencies should certainly have consoled themselves with the reflection that they were not misrepresented by Unionists as was the case with regard to the majority. One of the first acts of the Union Parliament was to "abolish" the Scottish Privy Council. As the Union was itself invalid, the Parliament had no right whatever to do this, or to make laws in any shape or form affecting Scotland. But its action is interesting as showing how the English majority was determined to treat Scotland. The Scottish members on this occasion, and on most subsequent occasions, were divided among themselves; some favoured the English Government's proposals, and some were opposed to them. Events were to prove that this was to be the usual attitude of the Scottish "representatives." Since they had decided in 1707 to go to Westminster, and later on, as we have seen, failed to adopt a more manly and patriotic attitude at the suggestion of Lockhart, the least

The Scottish Review

that could be expected of them was that they should present a united front to those who made attacks on the liberties of Scotland. But this was precisely what they usually failed to do.

In 1708, the first election to the United Parliaments took place. The electorate was small and in no way representative of the sentiments of the Scottish people (*vide infra*). Moreover, the Court party manipulated the elections, excluding a great many of their opponents "on petitions against them as unduly elected ; in which, having no regard to law or justice, they turn'd out and brought in whom they pleas'd ; and thereby made up a certain majority in all events" (*Lockhart Papers I.* 296, 297). All the posts in Scotland were given, as Burnet notes, to persons recommended by the Duke of Queensberry, the head of the Court faction. This election is noticeable for the fact that it placed the parliamentary balance of power in the hands of the Scottish members. The two English parties—the Whigs and the Tories—were so evenly divided that a united Scottish party could have given the victory to whichever English party it chose to support. So long as the English were fairly equally divided among themselves, this was an intelligible policy, and it was successfully adopted in the case of the disputed election for the city of Westminster, when, for personal reasons, the Scottish members united to oppose the member returned. But the Scots were usually divided into opposing factions in this and subsequent Parliaments, and on the few occasions when they united, it was quite easy for the predominant English party, or, failing that, a combination of English

Scotland at Westminster

parties, to outvote them. Only very rarely did the Scots unite, with what little result we shall see later. As Dr. James Mackinnon remarks, "the adhesion to the traditions of party has been stronger than the claims of patriotism," and the interests of Scotland "have suffered from the pliability of Scottish members as much as from the neglect of Englishmen" (*Union of England and Scotland*, p. 372).

Lockhart of Carnwath also pointed out the advantages of the balance of power policy, but his advice fell on unheeding ears. Soon after the election, the Scottish members assisted in the return of forty "Court Whigs," who replaced a corresponding number of members less amenable to Court influence. The Scots no longer possessed the balance of power as a result of this senseless action on their part. The Court Whigs "becoming thereby so very strong and numerous in the House that they needed not the assistance of the Scots, acted a part quite opposite to their fair promises at the beginning. For by them a Bill was brought in under the specious title of rendering the Union more complete, the purport of which was to abrogate the Scots laws and forms of tryall in cases of high treason and impose those of England for the future" (*Lockhart Papers* I., 531). The Scots law of treason was much fairer than the corresponding English law, and the same can be said of many other of the old laws of Scotland. But this consideration weighed nothing with Englishmen, any more than did the fact that any tampering with the constitution and powers of the Scottish Court of Justiciary was expressly forbidden by the Act of Union, an Act which

The Scottish Review

the English Government had pledged itself to observe. For once in a way, the Scottish members offered a united opposition, but, having lost the balance of power by their own act, their resistance was fruitless. With one or two trifling alterations, the obnoxious Act passed, all the Court Whigs, whom the Scots had so recently assisted, voting against them.

In 1710, a large anti-Union majority was returned for Scotland. The same year witnessed another breach of the Act of Union, the nineteenth article of which provided that "no causes in Scotland be cognoscible by the Courts of Chancery, Queens-Bench, Common-Pleas, or any other Court in Westminster-hall ; and that the said Courts, or any other of the like nature after the Union, shall have no power to cognose, review or alter the acts or sentences of the Judicatures within Scotland, or stop the execution of the same." This article was infringed when the House of Lords heard the appeal from, and overturned the decision of, the Court of Session in the well-known case of the Episcopalian clergyman, Greenshields. On this occasion also, the Scots members were divided among themselves, as they were over the restoration of patronage in the Established Church two years later. The Scots Parliament had abolished patronage in 1690. The English Parliament, at the same time that it agreed to the Act of Union, had assented to the ecclesiastical act of Security, confirming the privileges of the Scottish Established Church. The scheming Churchmen, whose opposition to the betrayal of their country, had been bought off by this Act, came to know the worthlessness of English promises. The

Scotland at Westminster

restoration of patronage has been the cause of all the many secessions from the Established Church since the Union. No Scotsman, whatever his own private religious views may be, can do anything but deplore these disastrous secessions, not only because they necessarily tend to cause ill-feeling, and in many cases unseemly competition in religious work, but also on the broad grounds of Nationalism. The privileges accorded by the Scottish Parliament to the Scottish Church, to which the vast majority of the people belonged, were deliberately set aside by an alien Parliament, which was pledged to preserve them intact.

The Scottish trading classes soon experienced the worthlessness of English pledges. Bills for the imposition of a duty on the export of linen, in opposition to clause 14 of the Act of Union, and for the imposition in 1713 of a malt tax were passed in defiance of other clauses. The Scottish members united to oppose the malt tax, which must not be confused with the malt tax of 1725, but they were then confronted and overborne by a temporary coalition between the two English parties. Lockhart remarks that the English members "treated the Scots with the utmost contempt, and evidently shew'd that they valu'd the tax so much the more and were keener to impose it, that they saw it wou'd be a heavy burden on the Scots. This was the first instance since the Union, of a national disposition against Scotland. . . . in this affair, almost every man voted against the Scots. . . . They [the Scots members] cou'd not say that what had happen'd was the effects of the malice or other particular views of any one party, but the joint act and deed of all

The Scottish Review

England. And as this fell out in so short a time after the terms of peace were agreed to, they were confounded at the apprehension of what might be their country's fate when the peace was establisht and England had no forreign enemies to stand in awe of. These reflections had been more a propos some years agoe, before the Union was made, and when many expected nothing less than now occurred" (*Lockhart Papers I.* 416, 417). In the end, a secret assurance was given the Scottish members to the effect that the Bill would not be made applicable to Scotland. Even this concession was due not so much to the opposition of the M.P.'s, as to agitation in Scotland itself, and fear on the part of the Government as to what might happen there. A similar anti-Scottish coalition between the two English parties occurred in 1724.

The Scottish peers also had their special grievances, and soon found out how neatly England can twist treaties to the disadvantage of the weaker party to the bargain. Their venality had been displayed in the Union debates, and it was made equally manifest now, as is plainly indicated by the quotation already given from Bishop Burnet.

Of the years immediately following the Union, Dr. Hume Brown remarks:—"Every interest of Scotland was regarded and treated purely and simply with reference to the exigencies of political parties in England. There was not a class in Scotland which had not reason to complain of a breach of the articles of Union, and to regret that it had ever been accomplished. Clergy, merchants, peers, all in succession had their own special grievances which they were

Scotland at Westminster

powerless to redress, and from which the only escape, as it seemed, was the dissolution of that Union which had been the cause of all the mischief. To this end, indeed, converged the feelings of all classes in the country" (*History of Scotland* III., 145).

Whatever the party complexion of the ministry in power, whether Whig or Tory, Scotland experienced to the full the disastrous results of the treason of 1707. The very occasional attempts of the Scottish members to offer a united opposition only served to demonstrate its utter futility, so far as real and permanent reform was concerned. The temporary union of the Scottish factions certainly rendered the opposition in the English Parliament to measures prejudicial to Scotland more intense, but there is no evidence that it produced even such slight amelioration in the English-made laws as was occasionally brought about by other means. It is more probable that such superficial improvements were rather due to fear of the ever-growing discontent in Scotland itself. United parliamentary action made a supreme effort in 1713 to undo the Union, the motion for dissolution of the Union being proposed in the House of Lords by the Earl of Seafield, the protagonist of the Union of six years before. It was thrown out, but only by the narrow majority of four.

As means of escape from the fatal Union, there were two other courses open, either of which, if adopted, and in capable hands, would have given better results than the policy of talking twaddle at Westminster. One was the Lockhart policy of withdrawal from the English Parliament, to which reference has already been made.

The Scottish Review

The other policy was a recourse to arms, which, as everyone knows, was embraced in the '15 and the '45. Although these risings were partly dynastic in their origins, yet they also largely drew their inspiration from Nationalist sources. But, from a military point of view, both risings were mishandled, although in more competent hands either might have led to success, especially if they had been kept clear of movements, real or imaginary, for ecclesiastical changes. As the history of the risings is well known, there is no occasion to refer to them further.

The parliamentary history of the thirty years between the two risings is chiefly noticeable for the rivalry between the two Scottish factions known as the Argathelians and the Squadrone. There was no difference of principle between the two parties, for the simple and sufficient reason that neither of them possessed any principles whatever on which to differ, a matter in respect of which they much resembled parties in the English Parliament of to-day, all of which latter, as the events of the last three years have demonstrated, are capable of divesting themselves with remarkable ease of those principles which they pretend to hold dear. The two parties in question consistently placed their own private interests above the national interests of Scotland. The Government, continuing its practice of passing measures opposed to the general sentiment of the Scottish people, could always depend upon the support of one party or the other. "The English Ministry playd the two partys upon one another at the expence of the poor countrie" (*i.e.* Scotland) (*Lockhart Papers*, II., 157). "Divide and rule" has always been one

Scotland at Westminster

of the mottoes of imperialism. The Scots members were kept to heel the more easily, because ever since the Union they had been in receipt of salaries from the English Government ! Each man received ten guineas per week during the session, or, in other words, payment was made at the rate of £546 per year, but as the session did not last the entire year, the member did not actually receive this amount. Having regard to the special circumstances of the time, the member's salary, or "board-wages," as Lockhart bluntly termed it, was really very much higher than that of the paid and usually obsequious Scottish parliamentarians of our own day, who receive £400 a year, and, who in return, if we except a few well-known "gingerites," refrain from embarrassing the English Government by making any real effort to improve the state of affairs in their own country.

Under the above circumstances, political corruption was a natural result, particularly having regard to such venal "representatives" as were able to get themselves returned for Scottish constituencies. If any of these members did occasionally venture upon active opposition, it was easy for the Government to quiet them by the threat of a withdrawal of salary, as the English minister, Walpole, did upon one occasion, employing the elegant phraseology quoted by Lockhart, whose remarks upon the parliamentarians of his time are worth giving in full :—

"Had these members been endued with a publick spirit and resolution, such applications [in opposition to the proposed ale tax of 1724] would have been needless ; but as they consisted of a *parcell of people of

The Scottish Review

low fortunes that could not subsist without their board wages (which at ten guineas a week during each session was dully paid them) or meer tools and dependants, it was not to be expected they would act the part which became them for their country's service, and therfor these representations were judged necessary to spurr them up to their duty and withall show the Ministry that the people would not behave so tamely as did their mean spirited mercenary representatives, who, perceiving they would loss all their interest and scarce dare venture to return home if they did not follow the instructions given them, made most humble applications to the Ministry, who, on the other hand, being apprehensive the resentment might be carried to some hight, and, unwilling as matters stood in Europe, to embroil themselves at home, thought it expedient to drop the resolutions above mention'd [an additional duty of 6d per barrel on ale in Scotland, but not in England, and a similar unfair discrimination in the removal of the premium on exported grain] . . . and agreed with the Scots members to impose threepence per busshell on malt, being but the half of what was ley'd in England; and a bill was accordingly passt as fast as the forms could possibly allow of, least their constituents should have time to remonstrate against it. . . . Walpole plainly and frankly told these gentlemen when they applyd to him that they knew what money was raised and how applyd in Scotland, and they must lay their account with taying up their stokins with their own garters. Thus for supporting a parcell of corrupt locusts, the country must be oppressed, which at the same time indeed deserved no less for

Scotland at Westminster

electing such a sett, of whom no better cou'd be expected." (*Lockhart Papers* II., 139-141).

The quotation is interesting as showing the fruitlessness of parliamentary action, and the motives that dictate the actions of English Governments. It is also noteworthy that at this time the two English parties again combined against Scotland.

Payment of members had been the custom in the Scots Parliament from the days of James I., but the particular method in force had the merit of avoiding Government corruption, for the members were paid not by the Government, but by the constituencies, a practice confirmed repeatedly by Acts of Parliament. According to the Act of 1661, "His Majestie doeth therefore with advice forsaid modifie and appoint fyve pund scots of dailie allowance to everie Comissioner from any Shyre, includeing the first and last dayes of the Parliament, Together with eight dayes for their comeing and als much for their retурne from the furthese shires of Caithness and Sutherland and proportionable at nearer distances, and that the haill freeholders, heritors, and lyverenters holding of the King and Prince Shall according to the proportion of their lands and rents lyeing within the Shire be lyable and obligeid in payment of the said allowance, Excepting Noblemen and their vassalls. . . ." (*Acts of the Parliament of Scotland*, VII., 235). In the following year there was passed an "act concerning members of Parliament who doe not attend," according to which absentee bishops and noblemen were to be fined £1200 Scots, commissioners of shires £600, and commissioners of "burrowes" £200. For "each dyets absence without

The Scottish Review

leave," the respective fines were £12, £6, and £3 Scots (*Acts VII.* 371-2). This regulation was confirmed by an Act of 1690, which further laid down that the Clerk of Register was to give certificates of attendance to members for the correct estimation of their allowances. But towards the end of the seventeenth century, the tendency was to let these Acts fall into abeyance.

During the first ten years after the '15, the English Government had attached the Squadrone to its side, which was done for the very good reason that it appeared to be the more pliable of the two Scottish parties, and was also numerically the stronger. But these qualities, so useful to a Government, gradually became the distinguishing mark of the Argathelians, who, from 1725 onwards, enjoyed the favour of the ministry. At the election of 1722, the two parties combined under Government pressure to return a Government majority. The circumstances already alluded to, together with the smallness and unrepresentative nature of the electorate, made it easy to render official pressure effective, and, moreover, the officials used their power to manipulate the elections in favour of the Whig Government. Lockhart observes of the "representative" peers that the "Soverain had a fair, nay, almost a certain lay to gett such sixteen elected as he recommended, and their election depending thus in his favour, served as an awefand over them when elected, and hindered them from kicking out and entering into measures disagreeable to him . . . yet the little present gain which some of them enjoy'd from places and pensions of no great value influenced them to overlook the

Scotland at Westminster

honour and interest of their posterity" (*Lockhart Papers* II., 57, 83). At the election of 1722, official pressure was carried to such a height that a protest was registered by the Convention of Royal Burghs. Again, at the elections of 1727 and 1734, Government pressure was so strong and so successful that every one of the ministerial nominees for the Upper House was returned, but the corrupt influences were brought to bear in so secret a fashion, that it was difficult to prove a definite charge of bribery. By similar means, the Government, more particularly at the election of 1727, obtained a majority among the Scottish "representatives" in the House of Commons.

Pressure of another kind is mentioned by Wodrow in connection with the Dumbarton election in 1729, when one voter was temporarily imprisoned in the castle, and another marooned on one of the islands in Loch Lomond in order to deprive them of the opportunity of recording their votes. Wodrow remarks of elections in general :—" All is carried on by money ; and a man cannot be chosen unless he bestows five or six hundred guineas. Stanmore told my author he had spent five hundred guineas ; and Colonel Douglas said to him he had expended a thousand. All must have either a post or three or four hundred guineas, called travelling charges, up and down " (*Analecta* III., 228, 229).

Such being the character of the Scottish "representatives" and the manner of their election, it is not surprising to find that, when the Bill for the disarming of the Highlanders was brought in in 1725, "not so much as one Scotsman had the honestie and courage

The Scottish Review

to appear in behalf of their oppressed countrymen ; nay, the bill was brought in by Duncan Forbes (for which and other meritorious jobs he was soon after made Lord Advocat) and supported by the Duke of Argyle and all his dependants, so it passed both Houses and was made a law" (*Lockhart Papers*, II., 159). In these days of language revivals, it is interesting to note in passing that Lockhart records that in the same year (1725) the Government was meditating schemes for the suppression of the Gaelic language with the charitable intention "of dissipating that body of people."

After 1725, the influence of the Argathelian party was such that Lord Islay, the brother of its head, the Duke of Argyll (after whom the party was named), was known as the "King of Scotland." Many of those who on general grounds were supporters of the Union, and the Hanoverian dynasty, revolted against its policy and method and their inevitable consequences. Wodrow, for example, charged the Argathelians with " bringing Scotland to direct slavery and dependence upon England" (*Analecta* III., 436). This attitude became more pronounced as time went on. It was the misfortune of the Scottish people that they had no leader capable of directing and organising the national antipathy to the Union. The corrupt Argathelian party was indeed defeated at the elections of 1741, but those who took its place were no better qualified to redress the grievances of the country. The situation was beyond parliamentary remedy. Occasionally the English Government yielded, but only to violent agitation in Scotland itself. As a case in

Scotland at Westminster

point, I may mention the Bill of Pains and Penalties for the punishment of Edinburgh after the Porteous riots, a Bill which originally provided for the abrogation of the Town Charter and the imprisonment of its Magistrates, among a host of other insulting provisions. Another case is supplied by the Act ordering the parish ministers to urge their congregations to search out the slayers of Porteous. In both these cases, Scottish public opinion was too strong for the English Government, which had to give way.

The anonymous author of a work published in 1745, and entitled *The Present State of Scotland Consider'd*, attributed the extravagance and indebtedness of the Scottish gentry to the bad example set them by the Scots Members of Parliament, who were the "unhappy mean" of introducing habits of extravagance into their own country. The Scottish members were "tempted to ape the English," and in the dissipation of their own estates "tempted many of their countrymen and friends" to do the same.

The latter half of the eighteenth century was remarkable for the development of the commercial life of Scotland, in spite of the handicaps imposed by the Union, as it was for noteworthy contributions to science and literature, and the rising into prominence of ecclesiastical and social questions. This helped to draw the attention of the nation away from politics, a consummation aided by the failure of the war of '45, and the incompetence and corruption prevailing at Westminster. The time I speak of was largely an age of material interests, tending ever more and more to the drugging of the national consciousness and to

The Scottish Review

the prevalence of political apathy and indifference. The same period embraced the reign of the "Dundas despotism," a time when indifference to the national interests of Scotland reached great heights, and when the influence of Dundas in the Government was so great that Scotland was described by Lord Cockburn as not unlike "a village at a great man's gate" and as "prostrate at the feet of Dundas." "As for the rank of file of the Scottish representatives who sat at Westminster, they were in the main but the appendages of the English parties which in rapid succession displaced each other in the struggle for power" (Dr. Hume Brown's *History of Scotland*, III., 335).

The political apathy of the time and the low opinion commonly held as to the patriotism of the Scottish members is exemplified by a letter in the *Edinburgh Courant* (13/1/1762) in which the writer complains that there had been no enquiries as to whether they had been doing their duty towards their country or whether, on the other hand, "they are gone like our drovers to sell their votes as the others do their cattle," a remark which recalls the retort of the brother of the Earl of Seafield (of 1707 infamy) that it was better "to sell nowts" than to sell one's country, a sentiment to which he gave expression on being reproached by the Earl with having engaged in the cattle trade.

Boswell of Auchinleck described the parliamentarians in the fitting phrase, "a representation of shadows." Auchinleck was also responsible for the cynical remark that "that man was the best representative who brought the best pensions and places to his countrymen."

Henry Dundas was particularly prominent as a

Scotland at Westminster

patron of place-hunters. The members of the very limited Scottish electorate had but to turn to him to receive for themselves, or for their relations, an assured position in the Government service at a comfortable salary, which was granted of course on the tacit understanding that the electors would do their utmost to support the policy of the English Government, a policy in which most of them, devoid of national feeling as they were, were perfectly ready to acquiesce, quite apart from any pecuniary advantage to be derived from so doing. Dundas was President of the Board of Control of India, and in this capacity he appointed large numbers of Scottish place-hunters to lucrative positions in India. At various times he also held other Government offices, such as that of Lord Advocate, Treasurer of the Navy, Home Secretary, and others. Partly by virtue of holding these offices, and partly through the influence of his friends in the Government, further shoals of place-hunters were provided for. One of the results of his nefarious policy was that, throughout his long period of office, Dundas was always able to cast the votes of almost the whole body of Scottish members of Parliament according to Government wishes.

There are still some simpletons who point to the circumstance of certain Scotsmen occupying more or less prominent positions in the Government service, not only in the late eighteenth century, the period now under consideration, but at the present day also, as proof positive that Scotland flourishes mightily under the Union. The prosperity of a country cannot be measured by the fact that out of a total population of

The Scottish Review

millions, a few hundreds or thousands may have been enabled in one way or another to secure more or less profitable official employment in a more or less subordinate capacity, either in their own country or outside its borders. National prosperity is to be measured by the conditions of life prevailing among the millions not included in this category, and no one familiar with the conditions in Scotland of to-day can truthfully say that these millions are prosperous as a whole. National government does not necessarily involve general prosperity, but it is perfectly true to say that general prosperity and well-being cannot be had without national government, a form of government which Scotland has not enjoyed ever since the time of the pretended Union of 1707.

The corrupt influence of Dundas reached its meridian during the five years preceding his impeachment for peculation in 1805. At the election of 1802, out of the forty-five members that Scotland returned to the English Parliament, no fewer than forty-three were his nominees.—Even if attendance at Westminster had been the best means of redressing the ills afflicting the nation, the “representation” of Scotland by such a body of self-seeking rascals would have effectually discounted any possibilities of good in the system.

Lord Cockburn wrote as follows on the state of Scotland under the degrading regime of the unspeakable Dundas :—“A country gentleman with any public principle except devotion to Henry Dundas was viewed as a wonder, or rather as a monster. This was the creed also of almost all our merchants, all our removable office-holders, and all our public

Scotland at Westminster

corporations. . . . The infidelity of the French gave it almost all the pious; their atrocities all the timid; rapidly increasing taxation and establishments all the venal; the higher and middle ranks were at its command, and the people at its feet. . . . Henry Dundas was the absolute dictator of Scotland, and had the means of rewarding submission and of suppressing opposition beyond what were ever exercised in modern times by any one person in any portion of the empire" (*Memorials*, pp. 78-80).

Among the, at this time, dry bones of Scottish nationalism, there was some movement noticeable at the time of the intellectual ferment arising out of the French Revolution. Some Scotsmen, Nationalists, and democrats of an independent turn of mind, endeavoured to take steps for the liberation of their country. Of these, Thomas Muir was the most prominent. He outlined a scheme for the establishment of an independent Scottish Republic, a project which received the support of the French Directory, which went so far as to draw up a list of members, Muir himself being one, for a proposed Scottish Directory. In January, 1798, the English Government received secret information that the French Directory proposed to set up three distinct, separate, and independent republics for Scotland, Ireland, and England (*Dropmore MSS.* IV., 69, 70). But the place-hunting M.P.'s at Westminster, happy in the possession of their Government salaries, were as completely indifferent to these as they were to any proposals for the freedom of their country. In common with the majority of the Scottish ruling classes they were alarmed at the results

The Scottish Review

of the French Revolution. The "representatives" of Scotland had lost what little sense of patriotism they, or some few of them, at one time possessed.

Every now and again, when Scottish feeling was aroused, proof was forthcoming once more that while the English Government might ignore or overcome the opposition, or buy the support of the "representatives" at Westminster, it would certainly give way to strenuous agitation in Scotland. In December, 1825, the Government proposed to abolish the issue of £1 notes by the Scottish banks ; the matter was certainly not one of the highest national importance, but, such as it was, the Scottish people were united in their opposition to the proposal. Even Sir Walter Scott, silly "Unionist" though he was in most respects, was moved to a vigorous protest. In the following year, he wrote three letters to the *Edinburgh Weekly Journal*, under the nom-de-plume of Malachi Malagrowther. The English, he said, "adopted the conclusion that all English enactments are right ; but the system of municipal law in Scotland is not English, therefore it is wrong," a remark which would as well apply to the English political mentality nowadays as it did then. Scott censured the inactivity of the M.P.'s in the matter. In his second letter, he referred incidentally to the comparatively small proportion of the revenue from Scotland which was "dedicated to Scottish purposes." In the end, the Government gave way in the matter of the notes.

Concerning the general character of the post-Union Members of Parliament, Dr. Mackinnon makes the following observations :—"The presence of forty-five

Scotland at Westminster

Scotsmen at Westminster had palpably proved but a poor substitute for the national legislature at Edinburgh.

. . . Party intrigue within their own ranks, the manipulation of the ministers of the day, the all potent influence of English guineas, contributed to diminish their influence and left their country weak in a most vulnerable point" (*Union of England and Scotland*, pp. 455-6). Mr. Lecky is equally severe: he refers to Scotland as "one of the very few instances in history of a nation whose political representation was so grossly defective as not merely to distort, but absolutely to conceal its opinions. . . . It was habitually looked upon as the most servile and corrupt portion of the British Empire" (*England in the 18th Century*, III., 578-9). Such were the fruits of the blessed Union.

Reference has repeatedly been made in the course of this article to the small and unrepresentative nature of the electorate. At this point, it may be useful to go into the matter somewhat more fully. Until the Reform Bill of 1832, the number of electors was not only small, but negligible. For instance, in 1788, the total county electorate, as distinguished from the burgh electorate, only amounted to 2662, out of a total Scottish population of some 1½ millions. Ayrshire had the largest number of electors, 205; on the other hand the county of Bute had only 12. On one occasion the effective electorate of the last-mentioned constituency consisted of a single individual, who, with all due solemnity, returned himself to the English Parliament as the "representative" of the county. Even as late as 1830, out of a total population of about 2,360,000, there were only some 3000 electors, who were always ready to vote as commanded.

The Scottish Review

The report of 1788, from which the above figures for that year have been taken, was prepared for the use of the Whig caucus. It contains minute particulars as to the special wants of the 2662 county electors, which throw an interesting light on the extent to which place-hunting had usurped the seat of patriotism. For example, one man was a lawyer, who "wishes for a judge's gown"—what lawyer, by the way, does not? Another elector was a writer, who "would like employment and preferment"; another, more precise as to his requirements, "wishes for a clerkship of session." In return for voting as required, the powers that were always endeavoured to meet these more or less modest aspirations. The electorate, small as it was, was practically in the hands of the big landlords. Thus, of Ayrshire's 205 electors, the Earl of Eglinton could control and account for 27, Sir Adam Ferguson for 24, Sir John Whiteford for 16, the Earls of Glencairn and Dumfries for 13 each, and so on. Frequently there were no contested elections at all; at the General Election of 1790, there were only nine county contests, in which only 389 electors took the trouble to vote, the largest poll being in Perthshire, where 106 electors out of 145 exercised the suffrage, the smallest being in Cromartyshire, where the entire body of the electorate, six all told, went to the poll.

In the counties, only freeholders had the vote, and half of these (1308 out of 2665 in the year 1790) were what were known as "Parchment Barons," one of the many evil bye-products of the Union of 1707. The Parchment Baron was created for the express purpose of holding "Nominal and Fictitious" votes. Dr.

Scotland at Westminster

H. W. Meikle remarks that the landowners "conveyed pieces of land of the necessary value, in trust only, to their friends. The title-deeds were not registered, and were destroyed after they had served their purpose for an election" (*Scotland and the French Revolution*, p. 9). From time to time various abortive attempts were made to do away with the Parchment Baron, but in one form or another, the pest continued to flourish up to the Reform Bill of 1832. In some counties, the nominal and fictitious voters considerably outnumbered the real freeholders; in Banffshire, there were only 19 real freeholders out of 123; in Buteshire, only 3 out of 12; in Inverness-shire, only 20 out of 83. The Parchment Barons received their nominal grants of lands on the tacit understanding that they would vote for their patron's nominees.

The burgh members were chosen, directly or indirectly, by the Town Councils, the members of which bodies were nearly always self-elective for all intents and purposes, as each Town Council on the expiration of its term of office elected its successor in terms of the Act of 1469 (*Acts Parl. Scot. II.*, 95). Human nature being what it is, the councillors naturally re-elected themselves, except, of course, when the happy accident of removal to another world interposed insuperable obstacles. Before the Union of 1707, provisions as to residential qualification made by the Convention of Royal Burghs, had effectually prevented the application of pressure upon the Councils by outsiders desirous of being elected to Parliament. But after the Union (in 1743), the English Parliament passed an Act making it possible

The Scottish Review

for non-residenters to obtain seats in the Councils. The effect of this law was that these outsiders used the Councils for their own political purposes, obtaining jobs at ten guineas a week in the menagerie of corrupt intriguers at Westminster. The Court of Session gave judgment against the practice, but the English House of Lords overturned it in 1785, declaring that the Provost and Councillors need not necessarily be resident in the burgh.

As to the nationality of the members returned for Scottish constituencies, Mr. Porritt concluded that, out of the 535 members returned to 28 Parliaments in the period 1707-1832, only nine were Englishmen, and one of these never took his seat although elected. The first of the now abundant tribe of Saxon carpet-baggers was the Hon. George Damer, who was elected for the Crail burghs in 1778. The second was a man more widely known to fame, Charles James Fox to wit, who was returned in 1784 for the Kirkwall burghs. These two were the only cases of the sort in the eighteenth century. With regard to the counties, the free-holder qualification shut the door on the Englishman. After the Reform Bill, a greater number of Englishmen were returned for Scottish constituencies, almost entirely from the burghs. But since the Franchise Act of 1884, Englishmen have been all too frequently returned for the counties, as well as for the burghs, as Scotland has experienced to its cost, though the corrupt Whig party, whose "bosses" put forward these rich aliens, persist in countenancing this vicious system. English "representatives" of the Cabinet

Scotland at Westminster

class are the worst offenders of all; for example, Asquith and Winston Churchill habitually treat national interests with studied neglect.

As for the Scottish "representative" peers in the pre-Reform Bill period, the particular English ministry in power secured the men it wanted by the simple device of sending to Holyrood House a piece of paper, known as the King's List or the Treasury List, containing the names of the peers whom it recommended the subservient Peers of Scotland to elect as their representatives in the Lords.

The Reform Bill added some 60,000 voters to the Scottish electorate, although even this number was but a small proportion of the total population of over $2\frac{1}{2}$ millions. By the Bill of 1868, the electorate was increased to some 240,000 out of a population of over $3\frac{1}{2}$ millions, and by the Bill of 1884 to 318,000 out of over $3\frac{3}{4}$ millions. Although the Reform Bill swept away many abuses, such as the Parchment Barons, it concentrated political power mainly in the hands of the bourgeoisie, who certainly did not address themselves to the much-needed work of cleansing the Scottish political stables. National consciousness had decayed so much that no effort was made to form an independent party at Westminster. The Scottish members classified themselves according to English party labels, Whig or Tory, most of them adhering to the former persuasion, although in more recent years that political body has seen fit to hide its identity under the name of the Liberal party. The Whig party has never, in the whole course of its existence, distinguished itself by any particular

The Scottish Review

for non-residenters to obtain seats in the Councils. The effect of this law was that these outsiders used the Councils for their own political purposes, obtaining jobs at ten guineas a week in the menagerie of corrupt intriguers at Westminster. The Court of Session gave judgment against the practice, but the English House of Lords overturned it in 1785, declaring that the Provost and Councillors need not necessarily be resident in the burgh.

As to the nationality of the members returned for Scottish constituencies, Mr. Porritt concluded that, out of the 535 members returned to 28 Parliaments in the period 1707-1832, only nine were Englishmen, and one of these never took his seat although elected. The first of the now abundant tribe of Saxon carpet-baggers was the Hon. George Damer, who was elected for the Crail burghs in 1778. The second was a man more widely known to fame, Charles James Fox to wit, who was returned in 1784 for the Kirkwall burghs. These two were the only cases of the sort in the eighteenth century. With regard to the counties, the free-holder qualification shut the door on the Englishman. After the Reform Bill, a greater number of Englishmen were returned for Scottish constituencies, almost entirely from the burghs. But since the Franchise Act of 1884, Englishmen have been all too frequently returned for the counties, as well as for the burghs, as Scotland has experienced to its cost, though the corrupt Whig party, whose "bosses" put forward these rich aliens, persist in countenancing this vicious system. English "representatives" of the Cabinet

Scotland at Westminster

class are the worst offenders of all; for example, Asquith and Winston Churchill habitually treat national interests with studied neglect.

As for the Scottish "representative" peers in the pre-Reform Bill period, the particular English ministry in power secured the men it wanted by the simple device of sending to Holyrood House a piece of paper, known as the King's List or the Treasury List, containing the names of the peers whom it recommended the subservient Peers of Scotland to elect as their representatives in the Lords.

The Reform Bill added some 60,000 voters to the Scottish electorate, although even this number was but a small proportion of the total population of over $2\frac{1}{2}$ millions. By the Bill of 1868, the electorate was increased to some 240,000 out of a population of over $3\frac{1}{2}$ millions, and by the Bill of 1884 to 318,000 out of over $3\frac{3}{4}$ millions. Although the Reform Bill swept away many abuses, such as the Parchment Barons, it concentrated political power mainly in the hands of the bourgeoisie, who certainly did not address themselves to the much-needed work of cleansing the Scottish political stables. National consciousness had decayed so much that no effort was made to form an independent party at Westminster. The Scottish members classified themselves according to English party labels, Whig or Tory, most of them adhering to the former persuasion, although in more recent years that political body has seen fit to hide its identity under the name of the Liberal party. The Whig party has never, in the whole course of its existence, distinguished itself by any particular

The Scottish Review

solicitude for the national interests of Scotland. No English party or its subservient Scottish followers can be reasonably expected to do so. In some ways, the Reform Bill made matters worse for Scotland. It was the opinion of Lord Advocate Murray that before the Bill "it was possible to secure some time for Scottish business . . . but now the Lord Advocate was left to fight his own battles against the English members, who took up the whole time of the House. Thus Scottish legislation was pushed aside" (Mr. G. W. T. Omund's *Lord Advocates of Scotland*, series 2, p. 32). This is a familiar complaint at the present day.

The well-known and systematic outvoting of the Scottish members by Englishmen was illustrated in the debate in 1843 on a motion in the Commons, which, if carried, would have prevented the disastrous split in the Established Church in that year, a split which, as everyone knows, turned Scotland into two rival and warring ecclesiastical camps. By 25 to 12, the Scots members approved the motion, yet, owing to the usual English interference with a purely Scottish measure, it was defeated by 211 to 76. It is interesting to note that the late Mr. W. E. Gladstone, the latter-day idol of the Scottish Liberals, was among those who helped to outvote the Scottish majority. In the following year, English voters again turned the scales against a Scottish majority in the case of the University Tests Bill, and in 1854 they did the same in respect to a much-needed Education Bill. "Who cares about your Scotch Education Bill" was the remark of English members in 1860. Another Education Bill was shelved in 1871, on which occasion

Scotland at Westminster

very few Scottish members had the courage even to protest. These are but a few examples out of many of deplorable political cowardice and ineptitude.

Concerning the neglect of Scottish business about the year 1848, Mr. Omund remarks :—“ If, for instance, an important Public Health Bill for England had been brought in . . . the Government would have had to consider the convenience of four hundred and sixty-nine English members ; and, instead of being hurried through in the small hours of the night, it would have been discussed during several afternoon and evening sittings. . . . *But there were only fifty-three members for Scotland ; and of these, more than one-half could be depended upon to give no trouble* ” (*Lord Advocates*, p. 117). The italics are mine.

In 1853, there was established a body called “ The National Association for the Vindication of Scottish Rights,” founded for the purpose of calling attention to the neglect of Scotland at Westminster, and its unfair treatment as regards finance. This body issued an address to the Scottish people dealing with these matters. Although in no real sense a Nationalist body, it did succeed in drawing public attention to certain undoubted injustices from which Scotland still suffers. Yet the Scottish M.P.’s were so indifferent to these grievances that only one could be persuaded to attend the meeting of the Association.

The apologists of Liberalism are fond of pointing to the Crofters’ Act as one proof of the beneficent activities of that party as regards Scotland, and in particular the Highlands. There is not a word of truth in this stupid boast. The reforms effected by the

The Scottish Review

Crofters' Act were not due to the Liberal party : they were not even due to the sending of some half-dozen crofter representatives to Westminster. They were due to agitation in Scotland in the early 'eighties ; the crofter members themselves being merely one of the outward and visible signs of that agitation, without which there would have been no Act. The land agitation forced the Liberal party to eat its own words, after it had put up Sir William Harcourt to tell the Commons that the demands of the crofters were preposterous. The Liberal Government only agreed to such changes as it thought would dispose of the inconvenient agitation ; further reforms advocated by the crofter members being vetoed by arrangement between the two front benches. The good points in the Act were really the work of the crofters themselves and their friends ; the bad points were the work of the Liberal party, aided by their temporary allies of the Conservative party. As the Government designed, the effect of the small reforms brought about by the Act was to cause the subsidence of the promising agitation for land reform. Most of the crofter members also subsided : they became Liberals. Justice of the Peaceships and office were bestowed on some of them, with the usual soporific result, as of course was designed by the Government.

The recent Land Act also serves to demonstrate the backboneless, "fashionless" character of the vast majority of our "representatives." As originally introduced, the Bill was a very respectable measure of land reform, but agreement between the two front benches transformed it into a measure giving far too

Scotland at Westminster

many opportunities to reactionary landlords and money-making lawyers to work mischief. With a few exceptions, the Scottish members took not the slightest trouble to resist the changes, highly detrimental to the interests of our country, introduced into the Act by compromise between Whig and Tory. As per usual, they voted as they were commanded to do by the Government whips. Even if they had opposed the official amendments, the two English parties would have combined against them and outvoted them ; or possibly the Bill might have been dropped ; but such a contingency affords no excuse for the cowardice and inactivity of our "representatives." It merely serves to illustrate the futility of parliamentary action at Westminster.

The Churches Act of 1905 affords another example of what can be effected by agitation in Scotland. I do not propose in any way to enter into the merits or demerits of the feud between the Free and the United Free Churches. It is sufficient to point out that the decision of the English landlords against the latter body led to such an agitation in Scotland that in a very short time that body received back the greater part of the property of which the decision of the House of Lords had deprived it.

The history of Scottish parliamentarianism reveals a record of scandalous corruption, of extreme inefficiency, and of a pitiful waste of effort. The same sorry tale reveals grievous neglect of Scottish national interests, not only by the English, but also by the Scots M.P.'s. On the other hand, the record I refer to reveals gross subserviency, on the part of the "chosen of the people,"

The Scottish Review

to England and to English parties. That a few members for Scottish constituencies have in the past played a more or less independent part, as a few do still, is a circumstance which by no means suffices to remove the general feeling of disgust which any generous and impartial mind must experience when forced to contemplate these miserable details. The political atmosphere of Westminster is become so demoralising and corrupt that no non-English representation can reasonably hope long to maintain its freedom, usefulness and independence. Parnell, the ablest parliamentarian of his generation, founded a party which at first was independent, but which is now, as it has been for years, a mere rump to the Whigs. Parnell himself said that no party could preserve its independence in London for more than a few years.

History proves that action in Scotland is every way more potent for good than talking at Westminster. Let the future members for Scottish constituencies, pledged to the principle of the complete political Independence of Scotland, take up the discarded policy of Lockhart of Carnwath ; let them turn their backs on Westminster, and instead work, educate, and organise in Scotland. Such a policy would be far more advantageous to the interests of our country, far more creditable to the patriotism and foresight of our countrymen, independently of any question as to what is most in keeping with national dignity and honour, than that of recognising any English legislature as a fit and proper source and instrument of Scottish government and Scottish reforms.

H. C. MACNEACAIL.

The Housing Problem



HAT drastic measures are required to remedy the existing housing conditions is daily admitted. The war has aggravated many social evils, but none has been so intensified as the one which

I here have under consideration. While the needs of these nations in this respect are clamant, the Government has been content to sit quite unconcerned, appoint commissions, and issue reports and memoranda. Action has been invoked from every quarter of these islands, and not a week passes but strongly-worded resolutions are passed by local associations, trade and otherwise; but all these have proved insufficient to rouse indifferent departments from their settled lethargy. The housing conditions obtaining in the United Kingdoms to-day are a disgrace to twentieth century civilisation. Every rural district, and every urban area, has its own problem, but under existing conditions no attempt to remedy the existing sorry state of affairs is allowed, the Government having, shortly after the outbreak of the war, placed an embargo on building. While the needs of the nations in labour and munitions for war purposes are paramount, nevertheless that excuse is not to be regarded as sufficient ground to delay the consideration of one of our most pressing social problems.

A short time ago the Scottish Local Government Board issued to all local authorities in Scotland a memorandum asking them to make a return within

The Scottish Review

a specified time of the needs of their respective localities in respect of new housing accommodation for the working classes, and to discover to what extent private enterprise was likely to supply the requirements. To those who are ignorant of Departmental methods this request might well appear to be the precursor of action, but how often have not similar invitations been addressed, and returns made, and nothing more has come of it all? There must be no more fooling. The nation's needs demand attention. The lack of adequate housing accommodation has been very acute in our large industrial centres during the war. The demands of the Army and Navy for the necessary munitions of war have imposed a very heavy burden upon industry, and to meet the requirements of a great increase in output much additional labour was required, the effect of which has been a sudden influx of labour to centres of industrial activity from districts where such work could not be undertaken. The consequence of this movement has been overcrowding worse than ever before was known. The attention of the writer has been drawn to cases in which as many as fifteen persons have occupied a single apartment. What have our Public Health authorities been doing? Why have such scandalous cases been tolerated without their raising their voices in protest? Do they also require to be goaded into action? But what could they do? The work had to be done. The workers required shelter, be the means to give it them good or bad.

All over the country reports by medical officers testify to the horrors of overcrowding. Surely it is not too late to act, and surely it is not too much to

The Housing Problem

expect those usually dumb dogs, the nation's elected representatives, to raise their voices and swell the demand for immediate remedial legislation. As in many other instances Scottish opinion is here well ahead of the English Government. That the War Cabinet has one overwhelming preoccupation—the successful prosecution of the war—may be admitted, but there are Departments in existence for dealing with civil affairs, and they fail in their duty if they do not make adequate use of them. In this particular instance the Local Government Board is responsible, but from that quarter only a still small whisper is heard at odd times. Is the President afraid to submit his policy, or has he none to submit? He ought by this time to have some scheme formulated, having already received many deputations on this question, and on each occasion he has promised favourable consideration of the views placed before him. Or does the Treasury veto supplies for the carrying out of his scheme, assuming that he has framed one? Scotland would have no hesitation in ratifying any course of action which was calculated to rid the land of the housing scandal.

If the Treasury objects to vote supplies for housing purposes, what are its reasons for so doing? Does it consider the money required to be in danger of being lost? Surely nations which can spend £8,000,000 per day in waging war can find the necessary money to make a beginning in subsidising the local authorities, and yet remain in a state of solvency. Money spent on war ends in smoke, but money spent in providing homes for our people would yield great interest in the

The Scottish Review

shape of the improved physical qualities of the people. Better houses would mean healthier men and women; healthier people would mean increased general prosperity and efficiency.

Several attempts to solve this problem have already been made, but as time advances the evil grows apace, and before any further attempts are set on foot a careful investigation of the causes of past failures should be instituted. The evil is too acute to tolerate any further delay. We desire no fanciful schemes from political Rip Van Winkles. Any plan which does not consider the cause of past failures will, in all likelihood, end in disaster. The solution must be radical. Many wonderful plans are from time to time proposed, but their fault is that they do not go beyond the surface, and are therefore useless.

One class of reformers blames private enterprise, which they declare has totally failed. The sincerity of these men is not to be questioned. But has private enterprise failed? I hardly think so. It has not been given a proper chance. There is no doubt, however, that owing to the magnitude of the problem it were vain to expect private enterprise to do all that is necessary, but that is surely not sufficient ground for affirming that it has completely failed. Another factor, which is too often omitted, has caused the breakdown of private enterprise. For building purposes there are four essentials—land, labour, materials, and money—the last providing the other three. A man with money to invest resolves (let us say) to put it into buildings. Before he can do so he has to find suitable land for a site, and the necessary materials

The Housing Problem

have to be brought to the selected spot. He approaches the landowner and informs him of his intentions. The land is forthcoming, but the price demanded for it is almost prohibitive, though the price has to be paid or the scheme falls through. At the very outset a heavy burden in rent, acting like a millstone, is placed on the industrious individual who is desirous to improve the value of the land by erecting buildings upon it. As was to be expected, this burden, if it is assumed, is passed on to the consumer, in this case the occupier of the dwelling. The building materials are also extracted from the land, and a toll (in the form of royalties) has to be paid to the landowner for the right to extract these. Such tolls all come back on to the unfortunate consumer. The land, too, which was formerly lying idle, and valued at a nominal rate, suddenly increases in value. It is not an uncommon thing for a piece of land to rise a hundredfold in value as soon as the owner is aware of the demand for it. The injustice of this system rests in the rating of such land. Public bodies (*e.g.* building societies or municipal councils) have to pay the same toll as a private individual. Need we wonder that individuals are very reluctant to invest in buildings under such conditions. More profitable investments present themselves, and no initial fines to be paid to ground landlords terrify the subject?

A system of interest-free loans from Government for providing houses has been advocated by a certain school of thought. It is not my intention to discuss this plan in the course of the present essay. Before any advances (interest free or otherwise) are

The Scottish Review

made by the State, the State ought to see to it that these are devoted to the purpose for which they were voted. Under present conditions the greater part of such money would find its way into the coffers of those landowners whose land should be selected for the various housing schemes. No wonder that this class has suddenly become active supporters of housing reform. Their motive in agitating it is not in the least disinterested.

It should be clearly understood by everyone that the questions of land and housing are indissolubly knit together, and that to start by providing means for the erection of healthy homes for our people before solving the land question would be merely to put the cart before the horse, besides doing much further to entrench vested interests in land, and to legalise the present effete system of land tenure. A commonsense solution is required, and this can only be found by changing the basis of rating.

Our present system of rating does not differentiate between land and any improvements that may be made upon it. For purposes of taxation the two are rated together. The injustice of such a system is very evident. In our cities we find very congested areas where poverty and vice are rife. Under these conditions, many valuable young lives are annually lost to the State. In such areas infantile mortality has reached alarming proportions, and when the statistics are presented the public indignation is, naturally, great. The waste of human life on the field of battle is enormous, and stay-at-home Statesmen tell us that this is inevitable, however regrettable, but how

The Housing Problem

many are aware of the ravages among the young much nearer home? In our towns and cities we find, side by side, the mansions of the rich and the hovels of the poor. Is there no better lot in store for the latter? While there is such congestion at the centre, thousands of acres of unused land, suitable for building purposes, are locked up on the outskirts. This state of affairs is paradoxical in the extreme, but it is permitted by the law. What is wanted is to bring about the use of all such land for houses. Abolish the system which allows the "owner" to withhold it from use, or permits it to be used after he has asked and received a prohibitive rent for it. This can be done by requiring him to pay to the State taxes based upon the value which he would demand for the land were he approached by someone anxious to put it to its best use. Transfer rates from improvements to land values. That seems simple enough.

What would be the result of such a reform? There would be one rate for unused land and a similar one for used land, which means that land at present lying idle and suitable for building purposes, and assessed at a purely nominal figure, would be rated at the same rate as adjoining land on which buildings have been erected. It would thus no longer be a source of profit to the landowner to withhold land from use, and naturally there would be a downward tendency in rents, and, with cheaper land and all improvements on it exempt from taxation, there would be greater incentives to proceed with building, since the public would know that public enterprise was no longer subject to heavy

The Scottish Review

initial fines. Extensions could thus be made on the outskirts of our urban areas, and the congestion at the centres would gradually disappear.

The crying scandal of bad housing is not confined to our towns and cities. In rural districts we find people herded together in hovels which many a landowner would consider too bad to house his cattle in, and yet there are thousands upon thousands of acres of suitable land all around. Bad housing has been one of the factors responsible for the rural exodus. The young people desirous to marry have not been able to find homes in the villages in which they were born, and in thousands have been forced to leave the locality where they were bred and to seek homes in the towns, thus assisting to flood the labour market, besides competing for a home in already overcrowded areas. By changing the system as proposed above, plenty of land would be free for building purposes in the rural districts, and with land now available for this purpose, every inducement would be afforded to peasants to remain on the land, for the same policy which would make land available for building purposes would also give adequate guarantees to the peasant in respect of cultivation. Knowing that he would reap the full enjoyment of his labours, he would no longer turn his eyes to the towns. Here, then, would occur the golden opportunity of the builder or building society, or public authority.

The effect of the reform I advocate upon building would be very great indeed, for the depression in this trade is artificial, the demand for houses being greatly in excess of the supply. The taxation of land values

The Housing Problem

would not only affect vacant land, but there would also be a change in places where dilapidated buildings encumber the ground. Decayed and unsanitary buildings do not represent the best uses to which the land can be put, and with other more suitable up-to-date dwellings or business premises available, these decayed quarters would very soon be tenantless. This change would mean that the ramshackle buildings everywhere superabundant would gradually disappear. In this way the slum dwellings which have too long proved almost insurmountable obstacles to civic reform would vanish.

Nowadays, reformers are anxiously looking for a solution of the housing problem, and surely here it is. Any measure introduced, or any money voted for the purpose of providing healthy homes for our people, must be in great part wasted, unless at the same time, or rather before the money is voted, the problem of the land is satisfactorily solved. The present shocking conditions cannot go on for ever, and the sooner we face the disgraceful facts the better. It may be urged by some that so long as the war lasts we cannot hope to deal with such a question. That opinion is absurd. Surely it is not too much to suggest that immediate action should be taken, so that better conditions may await the return of our soldiers when the war is over. Besides, every effort will have to be put forth to save the child-life of the nation, for the wastage of human life on the battle-field has indeed reached alarming dimensions. On many occasions Scottish public authorities have clamoured for reform, but nothing has yet been done. Is the demand of Scotland

The Scottish Review

to remain unanswered until the English conscience is aroused? Let the people of Scotland energetically support those of her sons and daughters who are fighting for this cause. Had Scotland full control of her own national concerns the present state of affairs would not be tolerated for a moment. The delay and inaction of the Local Government Board have conspired to make Scotland poorer as regards the physical well-being of her people. No Scottish Parliament could have been in session in Edinburgh for a month without giving ear to the cry for land and housing reform, but, before we can hope for any great change, we must fight for political independence. If only Scotsmen would unite over the one issue of Scotland for the Scots, many of those problems which have so long exercised the public mind would soon be solved by Scotsmen, after their own fashion and according to their own ideals. The housing question is far too grave a one to admit of delay, and any weak-kneed policy or action tending to endanger the fight for reform should only serve to stiffen the resolution of Scotsmen, and make them double their efforts to secure speedy political independence.

JOHN L. CARVEL.



The Ebel

THERE is a small stream in the southern part of Wiltshire, of a size which, if it was Scottish, would entitle it to rank either as a "water" or as a burn. It was once famous for heavy baskets,¹ and even now it is conspicuous for the fact that while the neighbouring rivers—the Avon, the Wylye, the Nadder, and to a certain extent the Bourne—abound in coarse fish, pike, roach, and dace, and in grayling, no fish is known on the Ebel except the trout. How this is brought about I do not know; perhaps the spawning grounds on the Ebel are so gravelly that a large quantity of trout are propagated; and so the other fish are made aware that there is no room for them. But this little stream has even a

¹ On this stream, as it flowed through the meadows of Coombe Bissett, Homington, and Odstock, the baskets during a period of six years in the decade of the 'Forties were enormous, although there is this to be taken into consideration that the water was preserved, and that only two or three rods fished it. We may be inclined to think that the Ettrick Shepherd carried exaggeration too far when he described himself to Christopher North as taking cartloads of trout out of the Meggat; but fishers of the present day can hardly believe that sixty or seventy years ago an ordinary basket for two rods on the Ebel would be fifty trout, twenty of which, I have been informed, would weigh $1\frac{1}{2}$ lbs. apiece or over. Such a basket must have amounted to thirty lbs. at least. The largest basket ever made during this period on this stream (it was taken by one rod) consisted of ninety trout. I think they must have weighed nearly fifty lbs., for the fisher himself informed me that on this occasion he filled his basket twice, and partly a third

The Scottish Review

better reason for notoriety, if, as I believe, it bears a name which, in itself unique, is the original of the titles of scores of rivers whose names begin in "Al," "El," "Il," or some kindred syllable. At first sight there does not seem to be any connection between these three syllables and the word "Ebel"; but if we can trace the steps by which "Ebel" was shortened or corrupted into one or other of these syllables, and if we can show that all these streams, equally with the Ebel, possess two characteristics—smallness, and proximity to, in most cases a tributary position towards, some larger river—I think I shall have established the connection.

There can be no dispute over the first step, for the transformation of "Ebel" into "Ivel" is an easy one; the only real change that takes place is that of one labial into another. This change from "b" to "v" is a common occurrence in Celtic languages.

time; and I recollect that the basket he used to carry was a large one. The writer of this article himself remembers the arrival about fifty years ago of a basket from this water-side which consisted of thirteen brace of trout, many of them three quarters of a pound in weight, a few reaching one pound and a half, and none being much under half-a-pound—the weight of it could hardly be less than twelve pounds.

The present condition of the stream is lamentable. The reasons for its being so may be more than one. It is said that about the year 1880, a particularly dry summer allowed the villagers to sweep it almost clean of fish. At any rate, whatever was the cause of the failure, the supply of trout failed, and now watercress beds, once unknown, an improved system of irrigating the meadows, and continuous poaching carried on from year to year and all the year round, prevent the recovery of a stream which was once as unique in its productiveness as it is in its name.

The Ebel

In English topography we have two instances of "Ebel" becoming "Ivel"; there is an Ivel in Bedfordshire and an Ivel in Somerset, both, like the Ebel, small streams; both tributaries, the one of the Ouse, the other of the Parrett. I am in possession of facts which seem to give the reason why one stream should be termed the Ebel, while the two others are called the Ivel; for "Ebel" is an older form than "Ivel"; a "b" is often softened into a "v," but a "v" never becomes a "b." The English, therefore, might have been expected to meet with an Ebel some years before they met with an Ivel; and this is what actually happened. The West Saxons must have first become acquainted with the Ebel between 519 when they fought the battle of Charford, and 552, the year in which they took the fortress of Old Sarum, as the river lies between Charford and Old Sarum. When the South Gyrwas, or the Middle English, had so far pushed up the Ouse as to reach the mouth of the Bedfordshire Ivel we do not know, as we have not the assistance of the Saxon Chronicle or of Bede. But the Chronicle tells us that in 571 the West Saxons fought a battle with the Britons at Bedford, and we may suppose, according to Green, that after the battle, and when they were about to settle in the district, they met, probably to their surprise, with their Anglo-cousins who had already settled in the neighbourhood: they would have then turned back and left the country to the first comers.¹ If this is the case, the Ivel was known to the Teutonic invaders by the year 571, but probably not long before, as Green supposes that

¹ *The Making of England*, p. 125.

The Scottish Review

their progress through the Wash and up the Ouse must, from the nature of the country, have been laborious and slow. The Ivel which is the tributary of the Parrett, must have first become known to the West Saxons in 658, which the Chronicle names as the year in which the West Saxon King extended his conquests in Somerset to the Parrett, of which the Ivel is a tributary. We have therefore an Ebel about 530, an Ivel about 570, and a second Ivel in 658. From this we draw the inference that the latter form is a corruption of the former, a corruption that may easily be imagined when we consider a well-known characteristic of the Celtic languages. The statement that the English in their invasion of Britain came across two forms of a river-name, an earlier one and a later, is corroborated in Asser's Life of King Alfred¹; for we find the Dorset Frome, whose name must have been disclosed to the West Saxons between the years 600 and 700 (for that must have been the period during which they fought their way up the country from the mouth of the Stour and Poole harbour) called the Frauū or Frauv, about the year 900. The same process is carried on as in the case of "Ebel." In both instances the consonant, the "m" or the "b," letters closely connected, is softened into a "v," and then vocalised into "u"; "Ebel" becomes "Ivel" and then "Il." "Frome" or rather "Fram," becomes first "Frauv," and then "Frauu." I can give another instance of the early form of this word; a Frome runs into the Herefordshire Wye, and must have been

¹ Stevenson's Edition: Oxford, 1904. The "ffraw" in Aberffraw is the same word.

The Ebel

discovered by the West Saxons in their march up the Severn valley between the battle of Deorham fought in 577, and their return down the valley in 584.¹ The early date of its discovery prevented the stream being termed *Frauv* or *Frau*.

Before we proceed to the next step we must notice three variants of "Ivel"—"Yeuil," "Wivel," and "Givel." They are in fact the same variant. "Yeuil" and "Wivel" are "Ivel" with the "i" converted into a diphthong, and "Givel" is merely the French and Welsh method of writing and pronouncing "Wivel": thus Ivelchester² in Somerset, the modern Ilchester, is sometimes written Yeuilchester,³ sometimes Givelchester.⁴ The relation between "gu" or "g" and "w" is well known in grammar. We have "Guillaume" for "William," and "gardien" supplies us with our "warden"⁵ The old Welsh family system is termed indifferently "gwele" or "wele."⁶

Of the form "Wivel" we have several instances, and they are always to be found in small streams. We have a Wivelesford or Wiflesford on the Wiltshire Avon, at a spot where the Avon is a very small stream; a Wiveliscombe at the very head of the Tone, the river on which Taunton is built; and a Wivelsfield on a small tributary of the Sussex Ouse. The existence of

¹ See *Saxon Chronicle* under these years.

² *Ann. Monast.* ii., p. 240. Rolls Series.

³ *Ann. Monast.* iii., p. 486. R. S.

⁴ *Ann. Monast.* i., p. 145. R. S.

Florence of Worcester, ii. p. 24. London, 1849.

⁵ Earle's *Philology of the English Tongue*, p. 77—5th Ed.

⁶ See Seeböhm's *Tribal System in Wales*. London, 1904.

Another method of writing the river Wye was *Gwy*.

The Scottish Review

such a Celtic word as "Wivel" in the topography of such a Teutonic country as Sussex may excite surprise, but the scanty British remnant of population in Sussex could as easily perpetuate the name of a tributary as that of the main stream, the Celtic origin of which is indisputable.

We have not yet exhausted the number of "Wivels" in England, if, as I believe, we are able to include the word "Wivelrugge," which I take to signify "the ridge on the Wivel." All that we know as a certainty is that the Wivelrugge in question consisted of or contained a wood in the Forest of Malvern, and that it had been granted to the Monastery of Gloucester.¹ There are several indications that the "Wivel" in "Wivelrugge" implies a small stream. Firstly, within the bounds of the Forest of Malvern there was not only a wood called Wivelrugge, but also a torrent² or "rivulet"³ termed the Alun. But Alun or Alan is the diminutive of a contracted form of "Wivel," as I shall shew further on. It seems therefore likely that "Wivel" of Wivelrugge was the name of a small river, and that it was also termed the Alun.

Secondly, it is stated that close to the Alun is a "silvula,"⁴ but "silvula" and "boscus," the word applied to Wivelrugge, signify the same object. Therefore it is probable that the "silvula" mentioned in connection with the Alun is identical with the "boscus" connected with Wivelrugge.

¹ *Hist. et Cart. Mon. Glou.*, ii., p. 20. R. S.

² *Hist. et Cart. Mon. Glou.* ii., p. 230. R. S.

³ *Hist. et Cart. Mon. Glou.* i., p. 268.

⁴ *Hist. et Cart. Mon. Glou.* ii., p. 230.

The Ebel

Thirdly, the "Wivel" in "Wivelrugge" is subjected to the same changes as those undergone by the other instances of "Wivel"; that is to say, "Wivel" is contracted into "Wyl" and a suffix expressing diminution is added; thus, the word which is generally written Wivelrugge becomes in one passage Wylenrugge¹; this is precisely what happens with some other instances of "Wivel."

I regard the descent of "Ivel," "Wivel," and "Givel" from "Ebel" as certainly proved, and the links connecting them as too strong to be broken; but it must be mentioned that there is a difficulty involved in the assumption which is not easily disposed of. It is this—the Ivel of Somerset is also called the Yeo, and on it stands the town of Yeovil. It is difficult to believe that "Ivel" or "Givel" is not the same word as Yeovil, the town in accordance with a well-known habit taking the name of the river on which it is built. At the same time it is equally difficult to believe that Yeovil the town, and Yeo the river on which it stands, have nothing to do etymologically with each other. In order to do away with the difficulty, we should like to be able to designate "Yeo" as a name invented by some philologist to account for the fact that a town called "Yeovil" is built upon its banks; and this is the explanation which Canon Isaac Taylor gives:—some one, he thinks, has mistakenly considered that "Yeovil" is "the ville on the Yeo," the word Yeo being invented to support the derivation. But it is impossible to regard "Yeo" as a modern word, for there exist other Yeos against

¹ *Hist. et. Cart. Mon. Glou.* i., p. 31.

The Scottish Review

whose antiquity nothing can be said. Thus, there is a Yeo, which is a small stream running into the Bristol Channel near Weston ; there is a Yeo which runs into the Torridge above Bideford, and which, moreover, has on its banks a village called Alvington—a fact which seems to connect the name of the stream with the root “ Ivel ” ; for apparently it must at one time have been called the Alwen or “ Little Ivel.” There is another Yeo which falls into the sea at Barnstaple ; there is a Yeoford on the Taw near North Tawton ; and another Yeoford on the Creedy near Crediton ; and, lastly, Ivelchester, the modern Ilchester, is termed Ivechester or Yvechester, by Roger de Hoveden, a writer of the Twelfth century.¹ Although it is perhaps possible to suppose that “ Ive ” is shortened for “ Ivel,” it would be considered, I think, more correct to identify it with a river root which is found in Wye, or Wey or Eye. There is, therefore, a difficulty connected with the position in which Yeo and Ivel stand to each other which, I confess, I cannot clear up. Perhaps it might be solved by a reference to the early spelling of “ Yeo ” and “ Yeovil.”² We shall, however, proceed with our argument as if this difficulty had not occurred, for I do not think that it militates against it. I have shewn how “ Ebel ” has become “ Ivel,” or “ Wivel,” or “ Civil ” ; we will now shew how these three forms glide into “ Il,” “ Wil,” or “ Gel,” and, also,

¹ i., pp. 230, 239, 271, 273 ; ii., p. 56. R. S.

² There is a Yeolmbridge on the Otter, near Launceston. “ Yeolm ” seems a link between “ Yeo ” and “ Elm ” which might be a variant of “ Elen,” the “ m ” taking the place of “ n ” on account of the proximity of the “ b ” in “ bridge.”

The Ebel

I believe, into "Al" and "El." The proof of this is to be found in "Ilchester," the earlier form of which is "Ivelchester" or "Givelchester," and in the two villages on the Wiltshire Avon, Willesford, near Pewsey, and Wilsford, near Amesbury, the former of which is Wivelesford in Domesday, the latter, Wiflesford.¹

The number of small streams which have changed their "Ivel" or "Wivel" into a vowel with an "l" is not large, although it would not be inconsiderable if we could consider all the Wiltons to be "towns on the Wylle." This, however, we cannot do. We have an Ale in Berwickshire, the small tributary of a small stream, the Eye; we have a tributary of the Teviot below Hawick called the Ale; we have, not far from the Northumbrian Allen, an Ale Common and a town called Alstone, a circumstance which seems to suggest that at one time Ale, not Allen, was the recognised name of the stream. There is also the Isle, which, like the Ivel, is a tributary of the Somerset Parrett. That the correct spelling of "Isle" is "Ile" or "Il" may be inferred from the names of sites upon its banks—Ilminster, Ilmoor, Ilton, Iford. We must not be surprised at finding two streams of the same name flowing into a larger river within a few miles of each other; if "Ivel" or "Il" is merely the Celtic name for any small stream, then the proximity of the two Il's need not be wondered at. There are still some people who consider that "the river" is quite sufficient a designation for a neighbouring stream.²

¹ See Jones' *Wiltshire Domesday* under these names.

² "As we forded it (a tributary of the Struma) I asked my

The Scottish Review

I should like to add the Isla, a tributary of the Tay, to the list. The "s" in the word need not deter us from doing so, as it is not to be found in the old forms, but, although a tributary, the river seems almost too large to be a derivative from "Ebel."¹

I do not suppose that all the Wiltons in England and Scotland are towns on the Wylye or Wivel; but there is no doubt that the best known Wilton, the early capital of the West Saxon Kingdom, derives its name from that source. Not only is it situated on a stream which is considerably smaller than the Avon into which it flows, but we are expressly told that such is the meaning of its name. Florence of Worcester mentions it as a town situated on rising ground "qui est in meridiana ripa fluminis Guilou de quo flumine tota illa paga nominatur."²

companions for its name. 'Oh, it comes from somewhere far away,' answered one of them. 'Hasn't it a name?' I insisted. 'What kind of a name would you expect it to have? It is a river,' he rejoined, amazed at my stupidity. To a native, a river is 'the river,' a mountain 'the mountain.'"—Abbott's *Tour in Macedonia*, p. 151. London, 1903.

¹ "All that we can say is that the old forms (of Strath-isla, the valley through which the Isla flows) are Strat-ylif, ylay, yla, ily, and ila."—Macdonald's *Place-Names in Strathbogie*.

Skene's remark on the meaning of "Isla" is unsatisfactory. He thinks that the name of the island of Isla is the same word. This seems improbable; at least there is a distinct difficulty in assigning the same name to an island and a river. This difficulty Skene does not seem to recognise. He regards "Isla" as a Basque word.—*Celtic Scotland* i. p. 216.

The derivation of the island is given in the Proceedings of the Society of Scottish Antiquaries, 1881 and 1882, p. 248. If it is correct, it could not be applied to a river, as it is the Divided Island, in allusion to its being nearly cut into two parts.

² I, p. 90: London, 1848.

The Ebel

Among the other Wiltons I do not know of one that is on the banks of an Ivel or a Wylie ; but there are several which fulfil at least one condition of derivation from this root—they are situated on small streams. These streams may now own other names, or no name at all ; for perhaps the lapse of time and the disappearance of the Celtic tongue may have deprived them of the name which once belonged to them. Williton, near Watchet, is on a small stream ; the same may be said of the Wilton that is close to Taunton. The Wilton which is now a part of Hawick, although situated on the Teviot, one of the feeders of the Tweed, is generally supposed to derive its name from another source.

We have seen that there are two Wilsfords or Willesfords on the upper portion of the Wiltshire Avon ; there is also a Wishford on the Wylie, which is a tributary of the Avon. The question therefore arises, is "Wishford" a variant of "Wilsford," or are the first syllables of the two words unconnected ? It has been supposed that the "Wish" in "Wishford" is merely "uisge" the Gaelic for water, and that it is, therefore, the same word as the Ouses, the Wisks and the Usks of England. But I think that the occurrence of "Wilshford" as an alternative form of "Wishford" sufficiently attests its identity with "Wilsford."¹ It may be added that Wishford is termed Wylyesford in the Perambulation of Groveley in Edward I.'s reign.² Here, then, Wishford becomes "the ford on the Wylie," and thus is seen to be identical with Wivelesford and Wilsford.

¹ *Wilts Archaeolog. Mag.* iv., p. 200.

² *Wilts Archaeolog. Mag.* xix.-xx., p. 265.

The Scottish Review

The second syllable of Wylye has been a matter for dispute. It has been stated that while the first syllable is undoubtedly Celtic, the second represents "ea," the Saxon word for "water";¹ and I have heard the village of Wylye, which is precisely the same word as the river, spoken of as if it was properly "Wil-lea," "the meadow on the Wyl." But there is no necessity to give either the village of Wylye or its stream a hybrid derivation. Its oldest form, we are told, is "Wilavia," corrupted by the Saxons into Wilig, as proved by their chartularies;² and there are several other names of the same root which retain the second syllable—thus, there is a river Weluue, mentioned in a grant to the Monastery at Wells.³ This river has ceased to exist, at least by name, but it must have transferred its name to the village called Wellow, and must be the stream near Wellow which runs into the Bristol Avon under another name; it goes now by the name of the Milford brook. We have also in Hampshire a village of this name on a small and unnamed tributary of the Test,⁴ and I cannot help thinking that we have another instance in the neighbouring rivulet upon which stand Upper and Lower Wallop.⁵ At first the identity of "Wallop" with "Wylye" may seem fanciful, but Mr.

¹ *Treatise on the Nomenclature of the Anglo-Saxons*, p. 81.

² *Asser's Life of King Alfred*, ed. by Stevenson, p. 241; Oxford, 1904.

³ *Ibid.*

⁴ There is a village of the name of Wellow in Nottinghamshire.

⁵ There was a battle according to Nennius in the Fifth Century at Gualoph, apparently between two parties among the Britons, the Romanised Britons, and the National Party.—*Wilt Archaeolog. Mag.* xiii.-xiv., p. 270.

The Ebel

Stevenson tells us that "Wilavia" is the older form of "Wylie." If this is so, it is probable that there is a still older form; for generally "v" represents another letter, an "m" or a "b," softened. We may presume, therefore, the existence of "Wilabia," and, if this supposition is correct, we arrive at once at "Wallop." In addition to this it may be said that the position of Wallop and of the Hampshire Wellow favours their identity with the Wylie; for they are situated in a wild and woodland district which would naturally be left for some time unmolested by the invading West Saxons, or the kindred Jutes, and in which for that reason the Celtic speech would linger long. I call my readers' attention to the difference in age between "Wellow" and "Wallop," the latter being the older form; but we cannot make any deduction from it, for the two streams, being only about fifteen miles apart, must have become known to the conquerors of the Britons at about the same time. This feature, by which the "Al," "El," "Il," or "Wil," becomes a word of two syllables, and which consists in the presence of one of three kindred letters—"u," "v," or "w," in the second syllable—is to be found in the Elwy of Flintshire, the Alaw of Anglesea, the Alwy of Monmouthshire, and the Elwy or Ely of Glamorgan-shire. There are also other instances, those which substitute "g" or "gu" for "w"; these are naturally to be found in Celtic districts—there is the river Gele in Denbighshire, upon which Abergale is built; and there is the Guilly in Carmarthenshire with the village of Aberguilly. There is a Guele, near Cumnock in Ayrshire; and the Gelly burn that flows into the

The Scottish Review

Fifeshire Loch Leven.¹ Nor must we omit an example that is to be found in France. In Brittany there is a "pays de Guelou," a word which reminds us of "Guilou," the Celtic form of "Wylie." This "pays" is called in Latin "pagus Velaviensis," and it so happens that the old form of "Wylie" is Wilavia.² The coincidence seems to shew that "Guelou" and "Guilou" are the same word. Orderic Vitalis mentions a church of St. Martin upon the river Waiol, and the editor identifies it with a place called Saint Martin-sur-Guiel.³ Whether Guelou and Guiel are the same stream I cannot say.

We now come to the final change in the original word. "Ebel" was first altered into "Ivel," and then it resolved itself into "Al," "El," "Il," or "Wil." It has by this time become so attenuated that it is no longer susceptible of change, but it can still take a diminutive suffix—and this is what it does. It seems to be characteristic of Celts to make excessive use of diminutives; the inhabitants of Lowland Scotland, though speaking a Teutonic tongue, still use diminutives in their conversation to a degree unknown among their English neighbours who are more Teutonic in blood and temperament. So fond indeed have the Celts been of diminutives that they have been known to suffix two diminutives to a word—thus, the town of Kilmarnock is "Cille-mo-Ern-an-oc," "the cell of my little, little Ern," a much beloved saint

¹ The Wheel flows into the Upper Tees.

² *Asser's Life of King Alfred*, ed. by Stevenson, p. 241; Oxford, 1904.

³ *Orderic Vitalis*, iii., p. 37; Parisiis, 1838.

The Ebel

of the Sixth century¹; and they have practically gone through the same process in the case of many rivers whose names are derived from this source, for they have added a diminutive suffix to a word which was already in its signification a diminutive. All the streams termed "Ebel" or designated by some word derived from "Ebel" were small; generally they were very small streams, being either the tributaries of larger streams, or in close proximity to them. But in time, we may suppose, the single syllable into which Ebel had been corrupted was not considered sufficient to express fully the idea of pettiness, and so it was thought proper to accentuate the smallness of a river's dimensions by adding to it an "an," the well-known and frequently used Celtic suffix. We find that there are considerably more streams with this suffix than without it. There is the Allan which flows into the Forth by Stirling; the Eline or Ellen in Cumberland; the Allan, a tributary of the Upper Teviot; the Alne, a tributary of the Stratford Avon; the Allen that runs into the Dorset Stour; the Allen that flows into the Hampshire Avon by Fordingbridge; the Elwand or Allen that meets the Tweed above

¹ Probably "Erneneus filius Craseni" (*Adamnan's Life of S. Columba*, i. chap. 3, Edin., 1874). We find the following note in Reeves' *Life of S. Columba*, Dublin, 1857, p. 26: "Marnoc is a contraction of Mo-Ernin-occ, the prefix denoting 'my' and the suffix 'little,' so that the name thus altered conveys the additional expressions of affection and familiarity." We have taken Ernan or Ernin as the diminutive of Ern; we think we have seen this stated somewhere, but cannot verify it. Thus, according to Reeves, the saint is given one diminutive, while we give him two, but "mo" in itself almost amounts to a diminutive.

The Scottish Review

Melrose¹; the Elvan, at the head of the Clyde; the Elan that runs into the Upper Wye; the Alne, upon which Alnwick and Alnmouth are situated; the Alyn, a tributary of the lower Dee, in England; the Alwen, a tributary of the upper Dee; the Allen that flows into the Southern Tyne; the Alan near St. David's Head; the Allan that runs into the Cornish Camel; and the Camel itself, if it signifies, as is supposed, "the winding Ale," "cam." being the Celtic for "crooked."²

It is not improbable that the Welland, which for the larger part of its course forms the northern boundary of Northamptonshire, is another instance of a stream being called the Allan. Of the three rivers that empty themselves into the Wash, the Welland is the shortest. The presence of the "d" is no difficulty, as it may be regarded as excrescent, and there is a strong probability that a British population maintained itself for long in the Fens, for in one account of a disturbance caused to the hermit of Crowland, "Britonum," not "latronum" is the word that refers to the disturbers of the Saint's solitude. There is a Welland in Worcestershire, a small stream running into the Severn, which may be supposed to be another example.³

¹ Lang's *Highways and Byeways on the Borders*, p. 235. London, 1913.

² Close to Padstow is the river Alan, called also the Camb-Alan or Camel "a tortuoso meatu" (*Camden*, p. 140).

³ According to Canon Taylor, there is an Allen in Leitrim, an Ilen in Cork, an Aulne and an Ellee in Brittany.—*Words and Places*, p. 143, 5th ed. Columbanus who was also called Colman-Ela or Colemanellus, seems to furnish us with another example. He is said to have derived the latter half of his name from the stream near

The Ebel

There is a word which seems to contain within it another example of "Welland"—we mean the well-known name, "Wellington," which we hold to be "the town on the Welland." Our reasons for this supposition are these:—we are told that "g" has displaced "d" in the present participle of the English verb, and we know that in conversation some modern speakers drop this "g," while others sometimes insert after "n" an uncalled-for "g." There is no reason, therefore, why this should not have taken place here, for "Wellandton" might easily be written and pronounced "Wellington." This is the more likely, as the Wellington in Somerset, the Wellington in Shropshire, and the obscure Wellington, which lies eight miles to the north of Hereford, are all on small streams. In the case of the Wellington in Somerset, the idea that "Welling" represents "Welland" and that "Welland" is "Ellen" or "Allan," that is, "the little Wivel," is strengthened by the fact that a village named Wiveliscombe is situated within a few miles of Wellington, and is on the same small stream. It is not unlikely that in the Wellingborough of Northamptonshire, we have the same word, for it lies on a small stream; and the Welland, the smallest of the three rivers that empty themselves into the Wash, is in the same county.

There exists a variant of "Allan" which may be regarded as most unexpected; it is "Lune," the name

which he lived or was born. His church was Lann-Ela, now Lynelly, near Tullamore. He was born at Glenelly in County Tyrone in 555, and died at Lynelly in 611.

The Scottish Review

of the river upon which Lancaster is situated.¹ There are also two other Lunes, one in Yorkshire, the other in the county of Durham. There is a Lin-burn in the latter, and in Northumberland a Line which seems to demonstrate the origin of its name by its having an "Ellington" on its banks. The evidence in favour of this origin for the Lancastrian Lune is very plain. During the time of the Roman occupation the Lune was the Alauna ; for the town of Lancaster went by the name of "ad Alaunam." It cannot, indeed, be said that there is much difference in pronunciation between Allan and Alauna ; but this similarity in sound is not in itself sufficient to prove kinship or identity. There is then so far no actual proof that the two words are the same word. The proof, however, is reached when we know that the Worcestershire Alcester, now situated on the river Alne, was known to the Romans as Alauna, and corroboration is added when we know that a river of the name of Alaunus, mentioned by Ptolemy² as being between the Firth of Forth and a stream supposed to be the Wear, can hardly fail to be the Northumbrian Alne. Canon Taylor supposes Alauna to be "al-aon" or "the white avon" ;³ but we presume that "al-aon" is a word

¹ Taylor's *Words and Places*, p. 143 ; London, 1902. The Lune in Yorkshire, in the N.W. corner of the County, is a tributary of the Tees. A river Line falls into the Solway near Gretna, and although not a tributary, is smaller than all the neighbouring streams.

² See *Hist. of Ancient Britons*, by Giles, ii., p. 99 ; London, 1847. There are two instances where "Alan" is written "Alun. This brings the word a step nearer to Lune. One stream runs through Malvern Forest, the other into the Dee at Gresford.

³ Roemer in his *Origins of the English People and Language* gives the same derivation, p. 122. London, 1882.

The Ebel

invented to prove a statement ; and, besides, the link that connects Alauna with " Allan " and " Alne " is too strong to be broken.

It is worthy of remark that the diminutive of " Ale " comes into existence so early as the first half of the Second century ; for that was the date at which Ptolemy wrote. That " Alan " is the diminutive of " Ale " and " Elen " of " El " hardly needs demonstration, although the reasons why a river sometimes employs and sometimes does not employ the diminutive are not always very apparent. The existence of Ancrum, which is taken to mean " the crum or crook on the Alne,"¹ a village situated on the Ale, below Hawick, seems to prove that once " n " formed part of the river's name. Within a few miles of Allendale, a valley in Northumberland, we find Ale Common and the parish of Alstone, although Allen, not Ale, is the name of the stream. But Alcester, on the Warwickshire Alne, is not, we think, another instance. It is not " the chester on the Ale," but " the chester on the Alne," as is shewn in the Annals of Worcester Priory,² with the " n " elided for euphony's sake. A further instance of the connection between an Ale and an Allan is Yale-mouth in Devon, situated on the river Yealme. Here we have another change for euphony's sake, but of a different sort. The original form of the river's name must have been Elne or Yelne ; when united to " mouth " it changed its " n " into " m," and the two words combined became Yealmemouth or Yalemouth. But this combination

¹ *Lang's Highways and Byways on the Borders*, p. 169.

² Alicestria—*Ann. Monast.* iv., p. 426. R. S.

The Scottish Review

worked a change in the name of the river when it stood by itself. It had been the Yelne, it was now the Yealme ; that is to say, it retained the form which it had adopted in composition for the sake of euphony. This also seems to be the explanation of the reason why there is an " Ellemford " and not an " Ellenford " on the Berwickshire Whitadder.

It may seem strange that two neighbouring streams should be called by the same or nearly the same designation ; there must have been, I should have thought, some confusion ; but if, as I suppose, " Al," " El," or " Il " was originally applied to any small streams, our surprise will be modified. Thus we have in Somerset the Isle, which should be spelt without the " s," and the Ivel, within a few miles of each other. We have two tributaries of the Teviot, the Ale and the Allan, the one below, the other above Hawick.¹ In Northumberland there is an Alwenton on the Alwen, a small tributary of the Coquet, and yet there is the river Alne, with its village of Alnham, within a few miles of it. In North Wales we have four streams whose names are derived from the same source, within a district about fifteen miles square—the Elwy, the Alyn, the Alwen, and the Gele ; and, lastly, if the explanation given above of the word " Camel " is correct, we have the Allan running into the Camel, that is to say, " the little Ale " running into " the winding Ale."

¹ The Elvan, a tributary of the Clyde, and the Ewan, a tributary of the Annan, rise within a few miles of each other ; but Elvan is certainly a variant of Alwen, and Ewan seems to be a derivative from the root from which come Yeo, Wye, and Eye.

The Ebel

In those cases in which, of two rivers derived from "Ebel," one possesses the diminutive suffix, and the other does not, we should expect the former to be smaller than the latter, and this we sometimes find to be the case; for of the two tributaries of the Teviot, the Ale is longer than the Allan, and the Camel is longer than its tributary Allen. Near St. David's Head in Pembrokeshire there are two neighbouring streams, the Solfach and the Alan—the latter is much the smaller. On the other hand, in North Wales, the two tributaries of the Dee, the Alyn and the Alwen, both of which have the diminutive ending, are of much the same size as the Elwy, the neighbouring tributary of the Clwyd, which is without this ending, while all three are decidedly larger than a fourth stream, which is not a diminutive, the Gele. But if the rule is not absolute that of two derivatives from "Ebel," the one with the diminutive is the smaller stream, it invariably happens that of two contiguous streams, the one being a derivative from Ebel, while the other is not, the former is the smaller, generally very much the smaller stream. Thus the Bedfordshire Ivel is 18 miles long, the Ouse 143; the Elan, at the head of the Wye, 14 miles long, the Wye itself 135; the Ely of Glamorganshire is 7 miles long, the neighbouring Rumney 22; the Wylie is 24 miles long, the Avon into which it runs 61; the Alne of Northumberland is 18 miles long, the Coquet, which is close at hand, 40 miles; the length of the Allen, a tributary of the Southern Tyne, is 13 miles; of the other tributaries, the Rede is 22 miles long, the Derwent 30; the length of the Cumberland Ellen is 16 miles; that of the Derwent, a

The Scottish Review

short distance away, is 31 ; the Elwy, a tributary of the Clwyd, is 18 miles long, the Clwyd being 25 ; of two tributaries of the Chester Dee, the Alyn is 28 miles long, the Alwen 11, while the main stream is 72.¹

If, as I contend, some variant of "Ebel" was once the ordinary word among the Celts for a small stream, we should expect to find occasionally traces of this fact ; and these traces are, I think, to be met with. Thus, the Whitadder, a Berwickshire tributary of the Tweed, has an Ellemford on its upper part, and, lower down, there is the village of Allanton, where the Whitadder unites with its tributary or sister stream, the Blackadder. The inference seems to be that at one time Ellen or Allan was the title given indiscriminately to both streams ; or, perhaps, the Whitadder was the Ellen and the Blackadder the Allan. That something of this kind may have taken place is all the more likely because "Whitadder" and "Blackadder" are both, at least in their first syllable, Teutonic, and, therefore, comparatively modern words. Before the men of English speech called the two rivers "white" and "black," they must have borne names given them by the dispossessed Celts. On the South Calder, a tributary of the Clyde, there is an Allanton ; it seems to suggest that the South Calder was once the Allan. At the head of the Wiltshire Nadder is the village of Donhead. This apparently implies that once the Nadder was called the Don, and this is the more likely if "Don" in Celtic means "the deepriver," as the Nadder is distinctly slower and comparatively deeper than the

¹ The length of these rivers is not meant to be otherwise than approximate.

The Ebel

neighbouring streams, the Avon and the Wylie. There is also a second reason why the Nadder should at one time be called by another name, if, as is supposed, the word merely signifies "the water."

There are several Wiltons in different parts of Great Britain. That one of them, the old capital of Wiltshire, is "the town on the Wylie" there is no doubt; that the Wilton, which forms a part of Hawick, is of a different derivation there can be equally no doubt, if it was once termed Welltown and Willistown.¹ With respect to the others, one in Norfolk, three in Yorkshire, one in Somerset, a second in Wiltshire near Burbage, there can be no certainty as to the meaning of their first syllable; all that can be asserted is that if they are on a small stream, the suggested derivation may be correct. This is certainly the position of the Wilton, near Taunton.

There is a fairly long list of parishes of the name of Allington or Alvington, all or some of which may be "towns on Allen or Alwen." One at least, Allington, in the parish of Gresford, in Denbighshire, must be of this derivation. It is situated on a brook, running into the Dee. The brook's modern name I do not know, but the village is in Welsh "Trev Alun."² This settles the question. Then we have Allington on the Brit, a small Dorset stream that gives its name to Bridport; Allington, near Maidstone; Allington, on the Wiltshire Bourne, a very small stream. It is termed Allentone and Alentone in *Domesday*,³ but

¹ Lewis' *Topographical Dict. of Scotland*.

² Lewis' *Topographical Dict. of Wales*.

³ See Jones' *Wiltshire Domesday*.

The Scottish Review

Aldington in some medieval documents.¹ Further, we have West Alllington or Alvington in Devon, on a small stream; Allington in Lincolnshire; Allington in Wiltshire, a part of All Cannings; Alwington, in Devon near Bideford, situated on the Yeo, a small stream; Alvington in Gloucestershire; Elingdone in Wiltshire, which in Saxon Charters was termed Ellen-dune.² Alvingham in Lincolnshire, Ellinthorpe and Ellington in Yorkshire seem to be kindred names. The same may, perhaps, be said of some of the Altons, Eltons,³ and Alfords, in England and Scotland. It is possible that the Heyl, a small stream falling into the sea at the Cornish St. Ives, is a corruption of a shortened form of "Ebel": a few miles away there is a town called Helston, and a ford of the name of Helford.

There are two rivers in Scotland called "Almond," both small streams, the one a tributary of the Tay, the other flowing into the Firth of Forth. The occurrence of "Al" in their first syllable raises the question whether their name is derived from "Ebel" or not. One writer at least has thought so, and considers that "Almond" is the "Al monadh," "the burn from or near the hill." It is perfectly true that an old writer in mentioning the Perthshire Almond mentions it in connection with a "tulloch" or hill; but it is always advisable before the mind is made up upon such a subject, to refer to the oldest form of a word, and if we do so here we shall find that the "1"

¹ *Wilts Archaeolog. Mag.*, xxvii.-xxviii., p. 211.

² Jones' *Wiltshire Domesday*.

³ Elton in the county of Durham, near Stockton-on-Tees, is on a small stream.

The Ebel

has crept in, and that it is no part of the root. *The Ulster Annals* state that Egfrith of Northumberland, in his fatal expedition of 684, burnt "Tula Aman." This must be the present village of Tulloch, where the Almond falls into the Tay.¹ There are, besides, old documents in which the Perthshire Almond is written "Awmon," and the West Lothian Almond "Amon" and "Amuin." This causes us to be all the more certain that the word is the same as the modern word "Avon," the Gaelic "amhuin" and the Latin "amnis." The original form of the word, that is to say, the word in early Aryan times, must have been "Amon" or "Aman." This form the Romans retained, that is to say, they kept the "m." The Celts generally softened the "m" into "v," which is represented in Gaelic orthography by "mh," and hence we have the word "avon"; but sometimes elided the "v" and corrupted the word, at least in Ireland, into "aun" and "own"; and sometimes they preserved the original form for small rivers, at least in two instances. It seems a strange coincidence that while in the case of "Ebel" there has been corruption in all the river names except one, the little Wiltshire stream, the same process has taken place in the case of Aman with all rivers with the exception of two. The prosthetic "d" need be no difficulty; it is found in one spelling of the name of the burn above Melrose, and perhaps in the Welland of the Wash; it is a common feature in many words. There is an Almondsbury, with a neighbouring Alveston, not far from Bristol and close to the Severn; there is an

¹ Skene's *Celtic Scotland*, i., p. 266.

The Scottish Review

Almondbury near Huddersfield, but we cannot make use of them to draw any conclusion.

Two words of the same meaning and with nearly the same spelling are not necessarily connected in derivation. Professor Skeat tells us that "sorry" and "sorrow" are not from the same root; and I think I remember hearing the late Professor Mackinnon quoting, I believe, the opinion of the late Sir John Rhys, say that there was no connection between "Britain" and "Prydain," two names for the same island. There is a word frequently met with in the topography of Scotland, both Highland and Lowland, "allt," the Gaelic for a burn or small stream. We have it in "Alltnacealgair," "the burn of the deceiver," a Sutherlandshire village, and in "Garvald," a parish in East Lothian, through which runs a rocky rivulet, from which without any doubt it derives its name; for "garbh allt" means in Gaelic "the rough burn." Is then "allt" the same word as "al," which is the derivative of Ebel? Only Celtic scholars could decide this question. It may be added that in Lancashire, a part of England where the Celtic element was fairly strong until a comparatively late period, we have a small stream running into the sea to the North of Liverpool, called the Alt. That it is derived from "Ebel" may be doubtful, but it is certainly the same word as "allt."

This discussion upon "Ebel" and its derivatives is not meant to extend beyond the British Isles; but I cannot help drawing attention to the fact that on the Continent there are rivers, all of small size, whose names might conceivably be derived from this root,

The Ebel

the Alia near ancient Rome ; the Ailette, a small river to the N.E. of Paris ; the Ill in Alsace, a tributary of the Rhine ; the Alle on which stands the town of Allenberg, a tributary of the Pregel, which is a river in East Prussia ; the Allier, a tributary of the Loire ; the Ille in Brittany. All these streams, except that in East Prussia, are in districts in which the Celts were at one time settled, but I do not assert that the names of these rivers are derived from "Ebel," one reason why I do not being that it seems difficult to believe that the corruption of "Ebel" resulted both on the Continent and in the British Isles in a vowel followed by "l." I cannot, however, believe that the Guilou of Wiltshire is not the same word as the Gwelou of Brittany. It is possible to maintain the identity of "Guilou" and "Gwelou" and yet not to be certain about the other rivers that I have named ; for the North-West corner of Gaul is supposed to have received in the Fifth and Sixth centuries after Christ, a large influx of refugees from Britain, and they may have brought a new name to the river as well as a new name to the province in which they settled.

Before I bring this article to its conclusion, I must refer to two writers who discuss, the one the meaning of "Al," and the other that of "Ebel." Canon Isaac Taylor considers that "Al" comes from the Gaelic "all" which, he states, means "white."¹ I suppose that it is the root of the "Alps," the white mountains of Switzerland, and of "Albion" with its white cliffs ; but if he is correct as to the origin of "Al," then I must confess that I am mistaken. I think, however, I have

¹ *Words and Places*, p. 148. London, 1903.

The Scottish Review

traced the links that unite "Al" with "Ebel" so accurately and carefully as to avoid all contradiction. It is true that some streams are supposed to possess a colour; we have heard of the Blackwater, the Whit-adder, and of several 'wan waters,' but Mr. Taylor gives us no reason why the streams which he mentions should be considered white. The Deverill in Wiltshire may perhaps be the "white stream" because it runs over a chalky bed,¹ but no reason can be given why all the streams whose initial syllable is "Al" should be considered "white streams." Canon Jones gives to "Ebel" an alternative form, namely "Ebbe," and considers that the "el" in "Ebel" is possibly a diminutive termination. He regards "Ebbe" as equivalent to the Sanscrit "ap" and the Latin "aqua"² and, I presume, as the original of such river names as Yeo, Wye, Weye, and Eye. It is very possible that this is the derivation of the last four names, but I do not consider that he has given sufficient proof of the existence of "Ebbe." I presume that he deduces it by conjecture from the form "Ebbesborne"³ which at first sight, I admit, seems to signify "the burn of the Ebbe"; but I contend that "Ebbesborne" is in reality short for "Ebelesburne"⁴ through an intermediate form "Eblesborne."⁵ With regard to the "el," Canon Jones says that it is a well-known di-

¹ *Wilts Archaeolog. Mag.*, xxvii.-xxviii., p. 236.

² *Wilts Archaeolog. Mag.*, xiii.-xiv., p. 162.

³ *Sarum Charters and Documents*, ii., p. 388. R. S.

⁴ " " " " i., p. 289.

⁵ " " " " i., pp. 237, 238.

The Ebel

minutive suffix in Welsh.¹ It is certainly a suffix with the same signification in the Romance languages and in English. But this point is beside the question which I have in hand. I have not attempted to give the derivation of "Ebel"; it is very possible that it is a diminutive; all that I contend for is that "Ebel," from whatever source it comes, is the original of "Al," "El," "Il," their alternative forms and their diminutives. From this standpoint I have seen no reason to swerve. In conclusion it may be said that it is worthy of remark that the "Ebel" which has given their names to so many streams in Great Britain, and perhaps elsewhere, attains its final contraction not only in rivers divided from it by hundreds of miles, but also in its own little Wiltshire valley; for, while generally known in medieval writings as Ebbelesborne or Ebblesborne or Ebbesborne, it is found in one document in its final stage and becomes Eleborne.²

GEOFFRY HILL.

¹ *Wilts Archaeolog. Mag.* xiii.-xiv., p. 162.

² *Sarum Charters and Documents*, i., p. 164.



Owre the Hill

O gin I had a motor car,
I'd ride awa', O far, sae far,
On, an' on, an' onward still,
Whaur the road gangs owre the tap o' the hill.

Owre the hill creep the bonnie stars,
An' the sun it keeks thro' gowden bars,
An' the bonnie clouds they seem to me
Like silver boats in a gowden sea.

The bonnie rainbow in the sky
Hides ahint the hill sae high :
Owre the hill the swallows flee
When the cauld wind sweeps the lea.

Gin I could only get ma will,
To gang awa' richt owre the hill,
I'd fill ma pooches wi' bonnie things,
Rainbow draps an' butterflees' wings.

But I maun play at the gairden gate,
An' gang to bed when it gets late,
But aye in my dreams I'm seein' still
A' the ferlies ayont the hill.

SANNY M'NEE.

[From *The Scottish Farm Servant*, September, 1917].

Correspondence

DEMOCRACY.

SIR,

I am surprised that a Review claiming to represent Scottish Nationalists should permit in its pages the advocacy of a governing policy (Democracy) which is foreign and antagonistic to the spirit and history of the Scottish race, as well as treasonable to the Scots Constitution.

As the Duke of Marr pointed out in his paper, "Enter the Celt," it was laid down, at the time of the Union of 1707, as a principle by which the Nation was bound, that "No Parliament or Power can legally . . . deprive any of the Three Estates of its right of sitting and voting in Parliament." Now, what are these three Estates? They are the greater and the lesser Baronage and the representatives of the Royal Burghs. Here is not a word about Democracy. What is the Democracy composed of? It is composed of the servants, labourers, and mixed peoples of the cities and towns, reinforced, apparently, by degenerate members of the upper classes, who have, through perverted instincts, allied themselves with the Democracy. Thus we arrive at in Scotland the same conception of Democracy as is implied by the terms of the Yankee Constitution, which declares all men to be equal, irrespectively of "race, colour, and previous condition." Plato said of Democracy that "after having devoured the best in the State, it in turn shall be devoured by the worst in itself," and Cucheval Clarigui, writing in *La Revue des Deux Mondes*, said, "Democracy is the government of a people in decay, and arouses the hatred of every friend to natural superiority, who can only wish to crush it out."

Even if we have to fight for it, we shall yet restore our ancient Constitution, with its King and Three Estates, free and pure, I

The Scottish Review

venture to hope, of the dangerous and degrading political doctrines which certain traitors and renegades are now preaching.

Your obedient Servant,

FORSYTH DE FRONSAC OF DYKES.

CANADA, *July 19, 1917.*

[Our correspondent, the Vicomte de Fronsac, writes as though the Scottish monarchy were an "arbitrary despotic power," and not a "legal limited monarchy" which the Claim of Right solemnly affirmed it to be, a claim which is abundantly confirmed by the whole tenour of the history of our country. Moreover, as the Coronation Oath bound the sovereign to preserve the rights of the Crown inviolate, as well as jealously to preserve the laws and Constitution of the country, it is plain that the Act of Union of 1707, to which Queen Anne set her hand, constituted a violation of that oath, so far as the Crown and the Constitution were concerned. The penalty of invading "the fundamental Constitution of this Kingdom" was duly visited upon James VII., and if Queen Anne, who was equally guilty, escaped the penalty enforced in the case of her predecessor, National Democrats may well be excused for regarding the throne as vacant, from that time to the present day. The rights and privileges of the Monarchy, since they originally issued from, so are they still centred in, the Scottish People. It is for them to declare whether they will be ruled by a Sovereign or not. They are equally free to enlarge or contract the terms of the Constitution itself. Our correspondent quotes Plato against Democracy. Doubtless, that great philosopher was a bitter enemy to popular rule; but, on the other hand, no stronger advocate of revolution has ever existed.]

ines

s.

ough
and
nny
the
f the
and
on of
ation
con-
ntion
Queen
in the
d for
day.
nally
It is
gn or
of the
t. De-
nemy
ate of

International Conference.

Scottish National Protest.

Societies and Clubs of all kinds are cordially invited to subscribe the Protest. Adhesions of this kind should be endorsed by the responsible Officers of such Societies and Clubs.

The following is published by way of guide to Societies desirous to adhere to the principles laid down in the Protest. It is one of many such, but a better form could not be adopted.

ASSOCIATED IRONMOULDERS OF SCOTLAND.

*Registered Office :—
221 WEST GEORGE STREET,
GLASGOW, 84 June, 1927.*

DEAR SIR,

NATIONAL PROTEST.

Your favour of the 30th ulto., along with enclosures received, was placed before a meeting of the Executive Council of this Association. I was directed to :—

- (1) Protest against the exclusion of Scotland, which, notwithstanding any pretended Act to the contrary, is now, as she ever was, a Sovereign State, and, as such, has an indefeasible right to send her own representatives to any International Congress.
- (2) Protest against the pretended right of England to appear and speak in name, and on behalf, of Scotland at any International Congress.

On behalf of this Executive Council,

I am, yours faithfully,

JOHN BROWN, *General Secretary.*

Individual Scots desirous to adhere, and otherwise to identify themselves with the National Protest, are invited to write to

The Hon. R. ERSKINE OF MARR,

The Forest of Birse Lodge,

Aboyne, Scotland.